arXiv:1612.06910v1 [math.AG] 20 Dec 2016

HITCHIN SYSTEMS FOR INVARIANT AND ANTI-INVARIANT VECTOR BUNDLES

ZELACI HACEN

Abstract. Given a smooth projective complex curve X with an involution σ, we study the Hitchin systems for the locus of anti-invariant (resp. invariant) stable vector bundles over X under σ. Using these integrable systems and the theory of nilpotent cone, we study the irreducibility of these loci. The anti-invariant locus can be though as a generalisation of Prym varieties to higher rank.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Preliminaries 4
3. Invariant and anti-invariant vector bundles 8
3.1. Invariant vector bundles 8
3.2. Anti-invariant vector bundles 11
4. The Hitchin system for anti-invariant vector bundles 17
4.1. $\sigma-$symmetric case 22
4.2. $\sigma-$alternating case 28
5. The Hitchin system for invariant vector bundles 32
5.1. Smooth case 34
5.2. General case 34
6. Appendices 38
6.1. Appendix A 38
6.2. Appendix B 39
6.3. Appendix C 39
References 41

1. Introduction

The Hitchin systems are integrable algebraic systems defined on the cotangent spaces of the moduli spaces of stable $G-$bundles on a Riemann surface. They lie at the crossroads between algebraic geometry, theory of Lie algebras and integrable system theory. Consider a projective, smooth and irreducible algebraic curve X of genus $g_X \geqslant 2$. Hitchin in [Hit87] has defined and studied some integrable systems on the moduli space of stable $G-$bundles over X, where G is a classical algebraic group (GL_r, Sp_{2m} and SO_r). Let $\mathcal{M}_X(G)$ be this moduli space, the tangent space

Date: December 22, 2016.

to $\mathcal{M}_X(G)$ at a point $[E]$ can be identified with

$$H^1(X, \mathrm{Ad}(E)) \cong H^0(X, \mathrm{Ad}(E) \otimes K_X)^*,$$

where $\mathrm{Ad}(E)$ is the adjoint bundle associated to E, which is a bundle of Lie algebras each is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$. So, by Serre duality, the cotangent bundle is just $H^0(X, \mathrm{Ad}(E) \otimes K_X)$. By considering a basis of the invariant polynomials on $\mathfrak{g}$, one gets a map

$$T^*_E \mathcal{M}_X(G) = H^0(X, \mathrm{Ad}(E) \otimes K_X) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{k} H^0(X, K_X^{d_i}),$$

where the $(d_i)_i$ are the degree of these invariant polynomials. Hitchin has shown that these two spaces have the same dimension.
In the case $G = \mathrm{GL}_r$, a basis of the invariant polynomials is given by the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial. If E is stable vector bundle, then this gives rise to a map

$$\mathscr{H}_E : H^0(X, \mathrm{End}(E) \otimes K_X) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} H^0(X, K_X^i) =: W,$$

which associates to each Higgs field ϕ, the coefficients of its characteristic polynomial. The associated map

$$\mathscr{H} : T^*\mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{GL}_r) \longrightarrow W$$

is called the *Hitchin morphism*. By choosing a basis of W, $\mathscr{H}$ is presented by $d = r^2(g_X - 1) + 1$ functions $f_1, \ldots, f_d$. Hitchin has proved that this system is *algebraically completely integrable*, i.e. its generic fibre is an open set in an abelian variety of dimension d, and the vector fields $\mathcal{X}_{f_1}, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_{f_d}$ associated to $f_1, \cdots, f_d$ (defined using the canonical $2-$form on $T^*\mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{GL}_r)$) are linear.

Moreover, let $\mathcal{U}_X(r, 0)$ be the moduli space of stable vector bundles of rank r and degree 0 on X. Consider the map

$$\Pi : T^*\mathcal{U}_X(r, 0) \to \mathcal{U}_X(r, 0) \times W$$

whose first factor is the canonical projection and the second factor is $\mathscr{H}$. Then, in [BNR89], it is proven that Π is dominant.

Suppose now that we have an involution σ on X, it induces by pullback an involution on the moduli space of stable vector bundles $\mathcal{U}_X(r, d)$. Let E be a stable vector bundle, we say that E is *anti-invariant* if there exists an isomorphism

$$\psi : \sigma^* E \xrightarrow{\sim} E^*.$$

We say that the anti-invariant vector bundle E is $\sigma-$*symmetric* (resp. $\sigma-$*alternating*) if $\sigma^*\psi = {}^t\psi$ (resp. $\sigma^*\psi = -{}^t\psi$). We denote by $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ and $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$ the loci of $\sigma-$symmetric and $\sigma-$alternating anti-invariant vector bundles respectively. We define the invariant locus to be

$$\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma}(r, d) = \{[E] \in \mathcal{U}_X(r, d) \,|\, \sigma^* E \cong E\}.$$

These varieties correspond to moduli spaces of the form $\mathcal{M}_Y(\mathcal{G})$, i.e. moduli spaces of $\mathcal{G}-$torsors over $Y := X/\sigma$ for some particular type of group schemes $\mathcal{G}$ (in the invariant case, they are called parahoric Bruhat-Tits group schemes, and they have been intensively studied by Balaji and Seshadri [BS14]).

The main topic of this paper is the study of the Hitchin systems for the anti-invariant and the invariant loci. We use these systems to identify the connected components of $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ and $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$. The irreducibility of the invariant locus (of a fixed type) is already know in more general setting (see [BS14]).
In this paper, by *Prym variety* of a cover of curves $\pi : \bar{X} \to \bar{Y}$ we mean the kernel of the norm map $\mathrm{Nm} : J_{\bar{X}} \longrightarrow J_{\bar{Y}}$ attached to π, which is in general nonconnected (hence it is not an abelian variety).
Our main result, in the case of the anti-invariant vector bundles, can be formulated as follows

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $\pi : X \to Y$ is ramified. We have the following results:*

(1) There exists a linear subspace $W^{\sigma,+} \subset W$, such that Π induces a dominant map
$$\Pi : T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r) \times W^{\sigma,+}.$$
Moreover, for general $s \in W^{\sigma,+}$, let $q : \tilde{X}_s \to X$ be the associated spectral curve over X, then $\tilde{X}_s$ is smooth and the involution σ lifts to an involution $\tilde{\sigma}$ on $\tilde{X}_s$ such that, if $\mathcal{P}^+$ is some translate of the Prym variety of $\tilde{X}_s \to \tilde{X}_s/\tilde{\sigma}$, then the pushforward rational map
$$q_* : \mathcal{P}^+ \to \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$$
is dominant. In particular $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ is irreducible.

(2) Suppose that r is even, there exists an affine subvariety $W^{\sigma,-} \subset W^{\sigma,+}$, such that Π induces a dominant map
$$\Pi : T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r) \times W^{\sigma,-}$$
such that for general $s \in W^{\sigma,-}$, the associated spectral curve is singular, and if $\hat{X}_s$ is its normalisation, then we have a dominant map
$$\hat{q}_* : \hat{\mathcal{P}} \to \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r),$$
where $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ is some translate of the Prym variety of $\hat{X} \to \hat{X}/\hat{\sigma}$, where $\hat{\sigma}$ is the lifting of the involution $\tilde{\sigma} : \tilde{X}_s \to \tilde{X}_s$ to $\hat{X}_s$. In particular, as $\hat{\sigma}$ has no fixed point, we deduce that $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$ has two connected components.

The two connected components of $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$ are distinguished by a cohomological criterion (similar to that given by the Stiefel-Whitney class, see subsection 4.2.1 for more details).

The étale case is little special. Assume that $\pi : X \to Y$ is étale, denote by $\Delta = \det(\pi_*\mathcal{O}_X)^{-1}$ the 2−torsion line bundle associated to π, then we have the following results

Theorem 1.2. *Choosing a line bundle on X of norm Δ induces, by translation, an isomorphism*
$$\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r),$$
and we have $W^{\sigma,+} = W^{\sigma,-}$. Furthermore, Π induces a dominant maps
$$T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r) \times W^{\sigma,+},$$
$$T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r) \times W^{\sigma,-},$$
And for general $s \in W^{\sigma,+}$, the pushforword map q_* induces dominant rational maps
$$\mathcal{P}^+ \dashrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r), \quad \mathcal{P}^- \dashrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r),$$

where $\mathcal{P}^+$, $\mathcal{P}^-$ are different translate of the Prym variety of $\tilde{X}_s \to \tilde{X}_s/\tilde{\sigma}$. In particular both $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ and $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$ have two connected components.

Remark 1.3. (1) If r is odd and $\pi : X \to Y$ is ramified, then $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r) = \emptyset$. In all other cases, the spaces $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ and $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$ are non empty (see 6.1 for the construction of stable anti-invariant vector bundles).

(2) If $r = 1$, then $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(1) = \mathrm{Prym}(X/Y)$, and if $X \to Y$ is étale, then $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(1) = \mathrm{Nm}^{-1}(\Delta)$.

The case of stable $\sigma-$symmetric vector bundles with trivial determinant, denoted $\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$, can then be deduced

Corollary 1.4. *For general $s \in W^{\sigma,+}$, the direct image rational map*

$$\mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathcal{Q}^+ \dashrightarrow \mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$$

is dominant, where $\mathcal{Q}^+$ is some translate of the Prym variety of the spectral cover $\tilde{X}_s \to X$. In particular we deduce that $\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ is irreducible.

We also prove similar results for the locus $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,d)$ of $\sigma-$invariant vector bundles of a fixed type τ. More precisely, for any type τ, we characterise a linear subspace $W^{\sigma,\tau} \subset W$ such that the Hitchin morphism $\mathscr{H}$ induces a map

$$T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,0) \longrightarrow W^{\sigma,\tau}$$

and $\dim(W^{\sigma,\tau}) = \dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,0))$. We prove again that this system gives a dominant rational map from a translate of a Jacobian variety

$$\mathrm{Pic}^\bullet(\hat{X}_s)^{\tilde{\sigma},\hat{\tau}} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,0),$$

for some type $\hat{\tau}$ of $\hat{\sigma}-$invariant line bundles over $\hat{X}_s$.

Plan of the paper. We start in section 2 by recalling the main results of the theory of spectral curves and the Hitchin systems. In section 3 we will give the basic facts about the invariant and anti-invariant vector bundles and study their loci, this is studied in more details in my thesis. In section 4, we study the Hitchin system for the anti-invariant case, and give the proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. In the last section we concentrate on the Hitchin systems for the invariant locus.

Acknowledgement. I am very grateful to my advisor Prof. Christian PAULY, who has led me during the preparation of this work, which, for sure, would not have been possible without his advices and encouragement.

2. Preliminaries

In this section we recall the general theory of spectral curves. Our main reference is [BNR89]. The ground field is always assumed to be $\mathbb{C}$.

Let L be any line bundle over a smooth projective curve X. Consider the ruled surface over X

$$\bar{q} : \mathbb{S} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_X \oplus L^{-1}) \to X,$$

where for a vector bundle $\mathscr{E}$ we denote $\mathrm{Sym}^\bullet(\mathscr{E})$ the symmetric algebra and

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{E}) = \mathrm{Proj}(\mathrm{Sym}^\bullet(\mathscr{E})).$$

Hence a point in $\mathbb{S}$ lying over $x \in X$ corresponds to a hyperplane in the fiber $(\mathcal{O}_X \oplus L^{-1})_x$. It follows that the total space of L denoted $|L|$ is contained in $\mathbb{S}$.

Let $\mathcal{O}(1)$ be the relatively ample line bundle over $\mathbb{S}$. It is well known that $\bar{q}_*\mathcal{O}(1) \cong \mathcal{O}_X \oplus L^{-1}$. Hence $\mathcal{O}(1)$ has a canonical section, denoted by y, corresponding to the direct summand $\mathcal{O}_X$. Also by the projection formula $\bar{q}_*(\bar{q}^*L \otimes \mathcal{O}(1))$ is isomorphic to $L \oplus \mathcal{O}_X$, so it has a canonical section which we denote by x.

Let

$$s = (s_1, \cdots, s_r) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} H^0(X, L^i) =: W_L$$

be an $r-$tuple of global sections of L^i and consider the global section

$$x^r + (\bar{q}^* s_1) y x^{r-1} + \cdots + (\bar{q}^* s_r) y^r \in H^0(\bar{q}^* K_X^r \otimes \mathcal{O}(r)). \tag{1}$$

We denote by $\tilde{X}_s$ its zero scheme which is a curve. We say that $\tilde{X}_s$ is the *spectral curve* associated to $s \in W_L$. Denote $q : \tilde{X}_s \to X$ the restriction of $\bar{q}$ to $\tilde{X}_s$. It is clear that $\tilde{X}_s$ is finite cover of degree r of X and its fibre over $p \in X$ is given by the homogeneous equation in $\mathbb{P}^1$

$$x^r + s_1(p) x^{r-1} y \cdots + s_r(p) y^r = 0.$$

Lemma 2.1. *The set of elements $s \in W_L$ corresponding to smooth spectral curves $\tilde{X}_s$ is open. In particular it is dense whenever it is not empty.*

Proof. Assume that $\tilde{X}_s$ is integral (i.e. reduced and irreducible, which is true for general $s \in W$, see [BNR89], Remark 3.1) and let

$$P(x,t) = x^r + s_1(t) x^{r-1} + \cdots + s_r(t) = 0$$

be the equation of $\tilde{X}_s$ locally over a point $p \in X$, where t is a local parameter near p. Then, by the Jacobian criterion of smoothness, $\tilde{X}_s$ is singular at a point $\lambda \in \tilde{X}_s$ over p if and only if

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial x}(\lambda, 0) = \frac{\partial P}{\partial t}(\lambda, 0) = 0,$$

i.e.

$$r\lambda^{r-1} + (r-1) s_1(0) \lambda^{r-2} + \cdots + s_{r-1}(0) = 0,$$
$$s_1'(0)\lambda^{r-1} + s_2'(0)\lambda^{r-2} + \cdots + s_r'(0) = 0.$$

Clearly these two equations give a closed condition on $s = (s_1, \cdots, s_r) \in W_L$. Hence the set of $s \in W_L$ corresponding to smooth curves $\tilde{X}_s$ is open. □

Remark 2.2. We remark that the criterion of smoothness given in [BNR89], Remark 3.5, is not correct. In fact the criterion assumes that the singular point is located at $\lambda = 0$.

Remark 2.3. An alternative way to construction $\tilde{X}_s$ is as follows: consider the symmetric $\mathcal{O}_X-$algebra $\mathrm{Sym}^\bullet(L^{-1})$. Define the ideal

$$\mathfrak{I} = \left\langle \bigoplus_i s_i(L^{-r}) \right\rangle \subset \mathrm{Sym}^\bullet(L^{-1}),$$

where $s_i \in H^0(X, L^i)$ is seen here as an embedding $s_i : L^{-r} \to L^{-r+i}$. Then $\tilde{X}_s$ can be defined as $\mathrm{Spec}\left(\mathrm{Sym}^\bullet(L^{-1})/\mathfrak{I}\right)$.

Suppose that $\tilde{X}_s$ is smooth and let $\tilde{S} = Ram(\tilde{X}_s/X) \subset \tilde{X}_s$ be the ramification divisor of $q : \tilde{X}_s \to X$.
Recall that

$$q_*\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_s} \cong \mathcal{O}_X \oplus L^{-1} \oplus \cdots \oplus L^{-(r-1)},$$

hence, by duality of finite flat morphisms (see for example Ex III.6.10, [Har77])

$$q_*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_s}(\tilde{S})\right) \cong \left(q_*\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_s}\right)^* \cong \mathcal{O}_X \oplus L \oplus \cdots \oplus L^{r-1}.$$

In particular, using the fact that for any line bundle M over $\tilde{X}_s$

$$\det(q_*M) = \det(q_*\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_s}) \otimes \mathrm{Nm}_{\tilde{X}_s/X}(M),$$

where $\mathrm{Nm}_{\tilde{X}_s/X} : \mathrm{Pic}(\tilde{X}_s) \to \mathrm{Pic}(X)$ is the norm map, we deduce

$$\deg(\tilde{S}) = r(r-1)\deg(L).$$

Furthermore, by Hurwitz formula, we have $K_{\tilde{X}_s} = q^*K_X(\tilde{S})$. Thus, by the projection formula we get

$$q_*K_{\tilde{X}_s} \cong K_X \oplus K_XL \oplus \cdots \oplus K_XL^{r-1}.$$

It follows that the genus $g_{\tilde{X}_s}$ of $\tilde{X}_s$ is

$$g_{\tilde{X}_s} = \deg(L)\frac{r(r-1)}{2} + r(g_X - 1) + 1.$$

Recall that for a stable vector bundle E, the Hitchin map

$$\mathscr{H}_E : H^0(X, E \otimes \sigma^*E \otimes L) \to W_L$$

is defined by

$$s \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_E(s) = \left((-1)^i \mathrm{Tr}(\bigwedge^i s)\right)_i,$$

where Tr is the trace map.
We recall a very important result from [BNR89]

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\tilde{X}_s$ be an* integral *(resp. smooth) spectral curve over X associated to $s \in W_L$. Then there is a one-to-one correspondence between torsion-free $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_s}-$modules of rank 1 (resp. Pic$(\tilde{X}_s)$) and the isomorphism classes of pairs (E, ϕ) where E is a rank r vector bundle and $\phi : E \to E \otimes L$ is a morphism such that $\mathscr{H}_E(\phi) = s$*

Maybe the most important case of spectral curves is when $L = K_X$. We denote simply by W the space W_{K_X}. In this case, the genus $g_{\tilde{X}_s}$ of $\tilde{X}_s$ is $g_{\tilde{X}_s} = r^2(g_X - 1) + 1$, which coincides with the dimension of the moduli space $\mathcal{U}_X(r, 0)$ of stable vector bundles of rank r and degree 0 over X. In [BNR89] it is proven that the map

$$\Pi : T^*\mathcal{U}_X(r, 0) \to \mathcal{U}_X(r, 0) \times W$$

is dominant. Moreover, the fibre $\mathscr{H}^{-1}(s)$ of a general point $s \in W$ is isomorphic to an open subset of $\mathrm{Pic}^m(\tilde{X}_s)$, where $m = r(r-1)(g_X - 1)$. We claim that this is still true for the classical algebraic groups Sp_{2m} et SO_r. Consider the moduli

spaces $\mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m})$ and $\mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{SO}_r)$ of $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}-$bundles and SO_r-bundles respectively which are *stable as vector bundles*. Define

$$W_{Sp_{2m}} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{m} H^0(X, K_X^{2i}),$$

and

$$W_{SO_r} = \begin{cases} \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r/2-1} H^0(X, K_X^{2i}) \oplus H^0(X, K_X^{r/2}) & r \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ \bigoplus_{i=1}^{(r-1)/2} H^0(X, K_X^{2i}) & r \equiv 1 \mod 2 \end{cases}.$$

For general $s \in W_{Sp_{2m}}$ the curve $\tilde{X}_s$ is smooth, and for general $s \in W_{SO_r}$ the associated $\tilde{X}_s$ is nodal curve. In this case we denote $\hat{X}_s$ its normalisation. In both cases, the involution of the ruled surface $\mathbb{S}$ that sends x to $-x$ induces an involution on $\tilde{X}_s$, we denote it by ι. Remark that in the singular case, ι lifts to an involution on $\hat{X}$ without fixed points.
Recall that Hitchin ([Hit87]) has proved that the map Π induces maps

$$\begin{aligned} T^*\mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}) \times W_{Sp_{2m}}, \\ T^*\mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{SO}_r) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{SO}_r) \times W_{SO_r}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Moreover, the generic fibre in the case of symplectic bundles is isomorphic to an open set of a translate of the Prym variety of $\tilde{X}_s \to \tilde{X}_s/\iota$. In the case of orthogonal bundles, the generic fibre is an open dense of the Prym variety of $\hat{X}_s \to \hat{X}_s/\iota$. We refer to [Hit87] for more details.

Proposition 2.5. *The restrictions of* Π *given in (2) are dominants. Moreover, for general* $s \in W_{Sp_{2m}}$ *(resp.* $s \in W_{SO_r}$*), if* $\mathcal{P}$ *is a translation of the Prym variety of* $\tilde{X}_s \to \tilde{X}_s/\iota$ *(resp.* $\hat{X}_s \to \hat{X}_s/\iota$*), then the pushforward map*

$$\mathcal{P} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{M}_X(Sp_{2m}) \ \ (resp.\ \mathcal{M}_X(SO_r))$$

is dominant.

Proof. Laumon has proved in [Lau88] that the nilpotent cone

$$\Lambda_G \subset T^*\mathcal{M}_X(G)$$

is Lagrangian, for any reductive algebraic group G. In particular, for $G = \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}$ (resp. $G = \mathrm{SO}_r$), we deduce that the locus of $G-$bundles E such that

$$\mathscr{H}_E : H^0(X, \mathrm{Ad}(E) \otimes K_X) \to W_{Sp_{2m}} \ \ (\text{resp. } W_{SO_r})$$

is dominant, forms an open dense subset of $\mathcal{M}_X(G)$. Indeed, we have

$$\dim(\Lambda_G) = \dim(\mathcal{M}_X(G)),$$

and the restriction of the canonical projection $T^*\mathcal{M}_X(G) \to \mathcal{M}_X(G)$ to Λ_G is surjective (because $(E, 0) \in \Lambda_G$ for any $G-$bundle E). Hence by dimension theorem, it follows that there exists an open dense subset of $\mathcal{M}_X(G)$ over which Λ_G is reduced to the zero section of $T^*\mathcal{M}_X(G)$. This open subset is by definition the set of very stable bundles E, for which, the map $\mathscr{H}_E$ is dominant.
It follows that the restrictions of Π given in (2) are dominant maps. Hence for general $s \in W_{Sp_{2m}}$ (resp. $s \in W_{SO_r}$), we get a dominant maps

$$\mathscr{H}^{-1}(s) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}) \ \ (\text{resp. } \mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{SO}_r)).$$

Furthermore, if S is the ramification of $\tilde{X}_s/\iota \to X$ (resp. $\hat{X}_s/\iota \to X$), $\mathcal{P} = Nm^{-1}(\mathcal{O}(S))$, where Nm is the norm map attached to the cover $\tilde{X}_s \to \tilde{X}_s/\iota$ (resp.

$\hat{X}_s \to \hat{X}_s/\iota$), then, by [Hit87], $\mathscr{H}^{-1}(s)$ is an open dense of $\mathcal{P}$. Thus the pushforward map

$$\mathcal{P} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}) \quad (\text{resp. } \mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{SO}_r))$$

is dominant rational map.
Remark that in the symplectic case, the involution ι has some fixed points, this implies that $\mathcal{P}$ is irreducible. While in the orthogonal case, ι is étale, hence $\mathcal{P}$ has two connected components, each one of them dominates a connected component of $\mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{SO}_r)$. In particular we deduce a cohomological criterion identifying the two connected components of $\mathcal{M}_X(\mathrm{SO}_r)$, more explicitly, take an even theta characteristic κ of X, then the two components are distinguished by the parity of $h^0(X, E \otimes \kappa)$. This is the same as the criterion given by the Stiefel-Whitney class (see for example [Bea06]). □

3. Invariant and anti-invariant vector bundles

Let X be a smooth projective irreducible curve with an involution $\sigma : X \to X$. Let $Y := X/\sigma$ be the quotient, which is smooth, and denote by $\pi : X \to Y$ the double cover map. Denote by $R \subset X$ the ramification locus of π, and let $\deg(R) = 2n$. If g_X and g_Y are the genus of X and Y, then by Hurwitz formula we have

$$g_X = 2g_Y - 1 + n.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{U}_X(r, d)$ the moduli space of *stable* vector bundles of rank r and degree d over X.

Let Z be a smooth variety over $\mathbb{C}$ with an involution σ. We define the fixed locus of σ, denoted Z^σ, to be the intersection of the diagonal $Z \subset Z \times Z$ with the graph $\Gamma_\sigma \subset Z \times Z$ of the involution σ. It is clearly a closed subvariety of Z. Moreover, we have

Lemma 3.1. *The fixed locus Z^σ is smooth.*

Proof. The action can be linearised locally around any point $z \in Z^\sigma$. In fact, this is true in more general context (see Edixhoven [Edi92]). □

3.1. **Invariant vector bundles.**

3.1.1. A vector bundle E on X is called $\sigma-$*invariant* if there exists an isomorphism

$$\varphi : \sigma^* E \xrightarrow{\sim} E.$$

A *linearisation* of the $\sigma-$action on E is an isomorphism

$$\varphi : \sigma^* E \xrightarrow{\sim} E$$

such that $\varphi \circ \sigma^* \varphi = id_E$. Hence a linearisation corresponds to a lift of the involution σ to an involution $\tilde{\sigma} : E \to E$, such that the following diagram



commutes. Using the linearisation φ we obtain a linear involution on the space of global sections of E, given by

$$s \longrightarrow \varphi(\sigma^* s).$$

We denote its proper subspaces by $H^0(X,E)_\pm$.

Remark 3.2. If E is stable $\sigma-$invariant, there are only 2 linearisations, φ and $-\varphi$.

Suppose that E is a $\sigma-$invariant *stable* vector bundle. We define the *type* of E to be

$$\tau = (\varphi_p)_{p\in R} \mod \pm .$$

We denote usually by k_p the multiplicity of the -1 eigenvalue of φ_p. Note that the vectors $(k_p)_p$ and $(r-k_p)_p$ represent the same type (due to multiplication by -1). Moreover, by looking at the determinant of E, which is $\sigma-$invariant, we obtain the following relation between the type and the degree d of E

$$\sum_{p\in R} k_p \equiv d \mod 2.$$

Denote by $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,d) \subset \mathcal{U}_X(r,d)$ the locus of $S-$equivalence classes of $\sigma-$invariant stable vector bundles of type τ. Note that $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,d)$ is smooth by Lemma 3.1. The following lemma is very useful (see [ND89]):

Lemma 3.3. *(Kempf Lemma) Let (E,φ) be a $\sigma-$linearised vector bundle on X (that's a $\sigma-$invariant vector bundle with a linearisation). Then E descends to Y (i.e $E \cong \pi^* F$ for some vector bundle F on Y, and φ is the canonical associated linearisation) if and only if $\varphi_p = id$, for any $p \in R$.*

A consequence of this lemma is the following

Lemma 3.4. *The canonical line bundle K_X of X descends to Y.*

Proof. By differentiating the involution $\sigma : X \to X$ we get a linear isomorphism

$$d\sigma : K_X^{-1} \to \sigma^* K_X^{-1}.$$

As $\sigma \circ \sigma = id$, it follows

$$d\sigma \circ \sigma^*(d\sigma) = id.$$

Hence $d\sigma$ is a linearisation of K_X^{-1}. Moreover if t is a local parameter near a ramification point $p \in R$, then $\sigma(t) = -t$, hence $d\sigma = -1$. So by Lemma 3.3 we deduce that K_X descends to Y. □

In particular, as by Hurwitz formula $\mathcal{O}_X(R) = K_X \otimes \pi^*(K_Y^{-1})$, we deduce that $\mathcal{O}_X(R)$ descends to Y. Furthermore, if we denote by Δ the line bundle on Y such that

$$\pi_* \mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_Y \oplus \Delta^{-1},$$

then $\mathcal{O}_X(R) = \pi^*\Delta$, hence $K_X = \pi^*(K_Y \otimes \Delta)$.

Remark 3.5. Suppose that π is ramified. Let L be a line bundle on Y, then $\pi^* L$ has a canonical linearisation. We call it the *positive* linearisation, (because it equals $+id$ over each $p \in R$). Its opposite is called the *negative* linearisation. Moreover, with respect to the positive linearisation, we have

$$H^0(X,\pi^*L)_+ \cong H^0(Y,L), \;\; H^0(X,\pi^*L)_- \cong H^0(Y, L\otimes\Delta^{-1}).$$

If $\pi : X \to Y$ is étale, then $K_X = \pi^* K_Y = \pi^*(K_Y \otimes \Delta)$. We define the positive linearisation on K_X to be the linearisation attached to $K_Y \otimes \Delta$.

3.1.2. *Infinitesimal study.* The tangent space to the moduli space $\mathcal{U}_X(r,d)$ at a smooth point E is given by

$$\mathrm{T}_E\mathcal{U}_X(r,d) \cong H^1(X, \mathrm{End}(E)),$$

where $\mathrm{End}(E) \cong E \otimes E^*$ stands for the sheaf of endomorphisms of E.

Recall that a deformation of E aver $Spec(\mathbb{C}[\varepsilon])$ $(\varepsilon^2 = 0)$ is defined to be a locally free coherent sheaf $\mathscr{E}$ on $X_\varepsilon = X \times Spec(\mathbb{C}[\varepsilon])$ together with a homomorphism $\mathscr{E} \to E$ of $\mathcal{O}_{X_\varepsilon}-$module, such that the induced map $\mathscr{E} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X \to E$ is an isomorphism. Canonically, the set of deformation of E over $Spec(\mathbb{C}[\varepsilon])$ is isomorphic to $H^1(X, \mathrm{End}(E))$. As by definition, a deformation is locally free, so it is flat, thus tensorizing the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathcal{O}_{X_\varepsilon} \to \mathcal{O}_X \to 0$$

by $\mathscr{E}$ we get

$$0 \to E \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} \mathscr{E} \to E \to 0.$$

Assume now that E is stable $\sigma-$invariant vector bundle of rank r and degree d, let τ be its type. We want to identify the tangent space to $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,d)$ at E.
The linearisation $\varphi : \sigma^*E \to E$ induces a linear involution f on the tangent space $T_E\mathcal{U}_X(r,d) \cong H^1(X, E \otimes E^*)$ given locally by

$$x_{ij} \otimes \lambda_{ij} \to \varphi(\sigma^*(x_{ij})) \otimes \sigma^*({}^t\varphi(\lambda_{ij})).$$

Clearly, this involution does not depend on the choice of φ.
Given $\eta = (\eta_{ij}) \in H^1(X, E \otimes E^*)$, it corresponds to an infinitesimal deformation

$$0 \to E \to \mathscr{E} \to E \to 0$$

over X_ϵ. In fact if we set

$$g_{ij} = \phi_i \circ (id + \varepsilon\eta_{ij}) \circ \phi_j^{-1},$$

where $\phi_i : E|_{U_i} \to U_i \times \mathbb{C}^r$ are some local trivialisations of E, then $\{g_{ij}\}$ are transition functions of $\mathscr{E}$ (we proof this in §3.2.2, Lemma 3.10 below).
Now $\eta \in T_E\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,d)$ if and only if $\mathscr{E}$ is $\sigma-$invariant. We can choose ϕ_i to be $\sigma-$invariant, hence $\mathscr{E}$ is $\sigma-$invariant iff η is invariant with respect to f. Thus

$$T_E\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,d) \cong H^1(X, E \otimes E^*)_+.$$

Proposition 3.6. *The dimension of the locus of $\sigma-$invariant vector bundles of fixed type τ is given by*

$$dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,d)) = r^2(g_Y - 1) + 1 + \sum_{p \in R} k_p(r - k_p),$$

where $(k_p)_{p\in R}$ are the integers associated to τ.

Proof. To calculate the dimension of $H^1(X, E \otimes E^*)_+$ we use Lefschetz fixed point theorem (cf. [AB68]), to simplify the notations let

$$h^1_\pm = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \left(H^1(X, E \otimes E^*)_\pm \right).$$

We have

$$\begin{cases} h^1_+ + h^1_- = r^2(g_X - 1) + 1 & \text{(By Riemann-Roch Formula)} \\ h^1_+ - h^1_- = 1 - \dfrac{1}{2}\sum_{p\in R} \mathrm{Tr}(f_p) & \text{(By Lefschetz fixed point theorem)} \end{cases},$$

we have used the fact that $h^0(X, E\otimes E^*)_+ = 1$ (the identity $E \to E$ is $\sigma-$invariant). By the very definition, $f_p = \varphi_p\otimes\varphi_p$, it follows that the multiplicity of the eigenvalue -1 of f_p is $2k_p(r-k_p)$, hence $Tr(f_p) = (r-2k_p)^2$, so we have

$$\begin{cases} h^1_+ + h^1_- = 2r^2(g_Y-1) + r^2n + 1 \\ h^1_+ - h^1_- = 1 - r^2n + 2\sum_{p\in R} k_p(r-k_p) \end{cases}.$$

It follows

$$\dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,d)) = h^1_+ = r^2(g_Y-1) + 1 + \sum_{p\in R} k_p(r-k_p).$$

□

Remark 3.7. The dimension of the locus of $\sigma-$invariant vector bundle $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma}(r,d)$ is the maximum of these dimensions :

$$\dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma}(r,d)) = \begin{cases} r^2(g_Y-1) + n\frac{r^2}{2} + 1 & r \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ r^2(g_Y-1) + n\frac{r^2-1}{2} + 1 & r \equiv 1 \mod 2 \end{cases}.$$

These dimensions correspond to the following types (called *maximal types*)

$$\mathfrak{MAX} = \begin{cases} \{\tau = (\varphi_p)_p \mod \pm \mid k_p = r/2,\ \forall p \in R\} & r \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ \{\tau = (\varphi_p)_p \mod \pm \mid k_p = (r+1)/2 \text{ or } k_p = (r-1)/2\} & r \equiv 1 \mod 2 \end{cases}.$$

In the odd case, the cardinal of $\mathfrak{MAX}$ is $2^{2(n-1)}$.

Using the results of Balaji and Seshadri (see [BS14]), we can identify the moduli space of $S-$equivalence stable $\sigma-$invariant vector bundles of type τ with the space of stable $\mathcal{G}_\tau-$torsors over Y

$$\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,d) \cong \mathcal{M}_Y(\mathcal{G}_\tau),$$

for some parahoric Bruhat-Tits group scheme $\mathcal{G}_\tau$ associated to the type τ. In fact, as we deal with GL_r-bundles, the parahoric group scheme $\mathcal{G}_\tau$ is of parabolic type. That's the moduli of $\sigma-$invariant vector bundles of type τ is exactly the moduli space of parabolic vector bundles with parabolic structures, related to τ, at the branch points of $X \to Y$.

3.2. **Anti-invariant vector bundles.**

3.2.1. A vector bundle E over X that admits an isomorphism

$$\psi : \sigma^*E \xrightarrow{\sim} E^*$$

is called $\sigma-$*anti-invariant* (or simply *anti-invariant*) vector bundle, where E^* is the dual vector bundle. If E is stable, then this isomorphism is unique up to a scalar multiplication. Take an isomorphism

$$\psi : \sigma^*E \xrightarrow{\sim} E^*,$$

by pulling back and taking the transpose we get an isomorphism

$$^t(\sigma^*\psi) : \sigma^*E \xrightarrow{\sim} E^*,$$

so there is a non vanishing $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, such that ${}^t(\sigma^*\psi) = \lambda\psi$. By applying σ^* and take the transpose on this last equality, we deduce $\lambda^2 = 1$, thus $\lambda = \pm 1$.
Denote by $\tilde{\psi}$ the non degenerated bilinear form canonically associated to ψ:

$$\tilde{\psi} : E \otimes \sigma^* E \to \mathcal{O}_X.$$

In fact we obtain $\tilde{\psi}$ as the composition

$$\tilde{\psi} : E \otimes \sigma^* E \xrightarrow{id\otimes\psi} E \otimes E^* \xrightarrow{Tr} \mathcal{O}_X.$$

Definition 3.8. We say that ψ (or $\tilde{\psi}$) is $\sigma-$*symmetric* (resp. $\sigma-$*alternating*) if $\lambda = 1$ (resp. $\lambda = -1$). We denote by

$$\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r) \subset \mathcal{U}_X(r,0)\ ,\ \ \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r) \subset \mathcal{U}_X(r,0)$$

the loci of classes of S-equivalence stable $\sigma-$symmetric (resp. $\sigma-$alternating) vector bundle E.

Note that $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ and $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$ are smooth by Lemma 3.1.

Observation. *Let E a $\sigma-$anti-invariant stable vector bundle of rank r such that $r \equiv 1 \mod 2$, and assume that $\pi : X \to Y$ is ramified, then E is necessarily σ-symmetric.*

Indeed, suppose that r is odd and that there exists a $\psi : \sigma^*E \to E^*$ which is a $\sigma-$alternating isomorphism, let $p \in R$ be a ramification point, then ψ_p is a symplectic form on E_p, this implies that $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(E_p) = rk(E)$ is necessarily even.

Let us see the case of line bundles. Consider a line bundle L such that

$$\sigma^* L \cong L^{-1}.$$

Because we have $L \otimes \sigma^* L \cong \pi^*\mathrm{Nm}(L)$, it follows that $\pi^*\mathrm{Nm}(L) \cong \mathcal{O}_X$, hence two cases may happen:

(1) If π is ramified, then π^* is injective, so $\mathrm{Nm}(L) = \mathcal{O}_Y$.
(2) If π is étale, then the kernel of π^* is $\{\mathcal{O}_Y, \Delta\}$, so either $\mathrm{Nm}(L) = \mathcal{O}_Y$ or $\mathrm{Nm}(L) = \Delta$.

Lemma 3.9. *If L is a line bundle such that $Nm(L) = \mathcal{O}_X$ then L is $\sigma-$symmetric. Assume that π is étale, then if $Nm(L) = \Delta$ then L is $\sigma-$alternating.*

Proof. The line bundle $L\otimes\sigma^*L$ has a canonical linearisation given by transposition. And the line bundle $\pi^*\mathrm{Nm}(L)$ has the canonical linearisation (which we have called positive in the ramified case). These two linearisations are the same modulo the isomorphism

$$L \otimes \sigma^* L \cong \pi^*\mathrm{Nm}(L).$$

Assume that $\mathrm{Nm}(L) = \mathcal{O}_Y$, the isomorphism $\sigma^*L \cong L^{-1}$ is indeed a global section of $L \otimes \sigma^*L$, which is unique up to scalar multiplication. Then by Remark 3.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} H^0(X, L \otimes \sigma^* L)_+ &= H^0(X, \pi^*\mathrm{Nm}(L))_+ \\ &= H^0(Y, \mathrm{Nm}(L)) = \mathbb{C}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that that L is $\sigma-$symmetric.
If π is étale and $\mathrm{Nm}(L)=\Delta$, then it is clear that L is anti-invariant, and again by Remark 3.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} H^0(X, L\otimes\sigma^*L)_- &= H^0(X,\pi^*\mathrm{Nm}(L))_- \\ &= H^0(Y,\mathrm{Nm}(L)\otimes\Delta)=\mathbb{C}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence L is $\sigma-$alternating. □

3.2.2. *Infinitesimal study.* We want to identify the tangent spaces to $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ at a point E.

Let E be a $\sigma-$symmetric anti-invariant vector bundle and $\psi:\sigma^*E\cong E^*$, suppose that E is given by the transition functions $f_{ij}=\varphi_i\circ\varphi_j^{-1}:U_{ij}\to \mathrm{GL}_r$, where the $\varphi_i : E_{U_i}\xrightarrow{\sim} U_i\times\mathbb{C}^r$ are local trivialisations of E. The covering $\{U_i\}_i$ of X is chosen to be $\sigma-$invariant, i.e. $\sigma(U_i)=U_i$ (to get such covering, just pullback a covering of Y that trivialise both $\pi_*\mathcal{O}_X$ and π_*E over Y). Note that we can choose $\{\varphi_i\}$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma^*\varphi_i : \sigma^*E_{U_i} & \longrightarrow & U_i\times\mathbb{C}^r \\ \psi\downarrow & & \downarrow\sigma\times I_r \\ {}^t\varphi_i^{-1} : E^*_{U_i} & \longrightarrow & U_i\times\mathbb{C}^r \end{array}$$

commutes. Indeed, by taking an *étale* neighbourhood U of each point $x\in X$, such that $\sigma(U)=U$, we can construct a frame $(e_1,\cdots,e_r)$ of $E|_U$ on which the pairing $\tilde{\psi}: E\otimes\sigma^*E\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_X$ is represented by the trivial matrix I_r. To construct such a frame, we apply the Gram-Schmidt process. As in this procedure, we need to calculate some square roots, that's the reason why we have to work on the étale topology. Moreover, we should mention that if we start with a frame $(u_1,\cdots,u_r)$ near x, it may happen that $\tilde{\psi}(u_i\otimes\sigma^*u_i)_x=0$, in this case, we just replace u_i with u_i+u_j, for some $j>i$ such that $\tilde{\psi}((u_i+u_j)\otimes\sigma^*(u_i+u_j))_x\neq 0$.
Taking such trivialisations, we get a transitions functions f_{ij} such that $\sigma^*f_{ij}={}^tf_{ij}^{-1}$. We know that the extension $\mathscr{E}$ (which corresponds to some $\eta=\{\eta_{ij}\}\in H^1(X,E\otimes E^*)$) is given by transition functions of the form

$$f_{ij}+\varepsilon g_{ij}: U_{ij}\to \mathrm{GL}_r(\mathbb{C}[\varepsilon]).$$

We want to find the relation of this transition functions with η. First of all, in order that $\{f_{ij}+\varepsilon g_{ij}\}$ represents a $1-$cocycle, we must have the two conditions

$$\begin{cases} g_{ii}=0 \\ g_{ij}f_{ji}+f_{ij}g_{jk}f_{ki}+f_{ik}g_{ki}=0 \end{cases}.$$

Now given $\eta=\{\eta_{ij}\}\in H^1(X,E\otimes E^*)$, which verifies $\eta_{ii}=0$ and

$$\eta_{ij}+\eta_{jk}+\eta_{ki}=0.$$

Each η_{ij} can be seen as local morphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \eta_{ij}: E|_{U_{ij}} & \longrightarrow & E|_{U_{ij}} \\ & {\scriptstyle\varphi_j}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle\varphi_i} & \\ & U_{ij}\times\mathbb{C}^r. & \end{array}$$

Denote by $g_{ij} = \varphi_i \circ \eta_{ij} \circ \varphi_j^{-1}$, we can rewrite the condition on η in the form

$$\varphi_i^{-1} \circ g_{ij} \circ \varphi_j + \varphi_j^{-1} \circ g_{jk} \circ \varphi_k + \varphi_k^{-1} \circ g_{ki} \circ \varphi_i = 0.$$

Composing by φ_i from the left and φ_i^{-1} from the right, we get

$$g_{ij} \circ \varphi_j \circ \varphi_i^{-1} + \varphi_i \circ \varphi_j^{-1} \circ g_{jk} \circ \varphi_k \circ \varphi_i^{-1} + \varphi_i \circ \varphi_k^{-1} \circ g_{ki} = 0$$

$$\Leftrightarrow g_{ij} f_{ji} + f_{ij} g_{jk} f_{ki} + f_{ik} g_{ki} = 0.$$

Lemma 3.10. *$f_{ij} + \varepsilon g_{ij} = \varphi_i \circ (id + \varepsilon \eta_{ij}) \circ \varphi_j^{-1}$ are transition functions of $\mathscr{E}$.*

Proof. Let $\eta = \{\eta_{ij}\} \in H^1(X, E \otimes E^*)$, locally the extension $\mathscr{E}$ is trivial, that's

$$\mathscr{E}|_{U_{i\varepsilon}} \cong E|_{U_i} \oplus \varepsilon E|_{U_i}, \;\; x \mapsto (\varpi(x), x - s_i \circ \varpi(x)),$$

where $\varpi : \mathscr{E} \to E$ and s_i is a local section of ϖ on the local open set U_i, and $U_{i\varepsilon} = U_i \times Spec(\mathbb{C}[\varepsilon])$. This isomorphism is $\mathcal{O}_{X_\varepsilon}-$linear.
Composing with the trivialisation

$$\varphi_i + \varepsilon\varphi_i : E|_{U_i} \oplus \varepsilon E|_{U_i} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{U_i} \oplus \varepsilon \mathcal{O}_{U_i},$$

we get a trivialisation

$$\phi_i : \mathscr{E}|_{U_{i\varepsilon}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_{U_{i\varepsilon}},$$

given by

$$\phi_i = \varphi_i \circ \varpi + \varepsilon\varphi_i(id - s_i \circ \varpi).$$

Remark that

$$\phi_i^{-1} = s_i \circ \varphi_i^{-1} - \varepsilon s_i (id - s_i \circ \varpi) s_i \circ \varphi_i^{-1}.$$

So, we calculate the transition functions of $\mathscr{E}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_i \circ \phi_j^{-1} &= (\varphi_i \circ \varpi + \varepsilon\varphi_i(id - s_i \circ \varpi))(s_j \circ \varphi_j^{-1} - \varepsilon s_j (id - s_j \circ \varpi) s_j \circ \varphi_j^{-1}) \quad \text{(because } \varepsilon^2 = 0\text{)} \\
&= f_{ij} + \varepsilon(\varphi_i(id - s_i \circ \varpi) s_j \circ \varphi_j^{-1} - \varphi_i \circ \varpi \circ s_j (id - s_j \circ \varpi) s_j \circ \varphi_j^{-1}) \\
&= f_{ij} + \varepsilon(\varphi_i(s_j - s_i)\varphi_j^{-1}) \\
&= f_{ij} + \varepsilon(\varphi_i \eta_{ij} \varphi_j^{-1}) \\
&= f_{ij} + \varepsilon g_{ij}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Now η is in the tangent space to $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ at E if and only if the corresponding extension $\mathscr{E}$ is $\sigma-$symmetric anti-invariant vector bundle on X_ε, where σ extended to an involution on X_ε by taking $\sigma(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon$.
On the transition functions, this means that

$$\sigma^*(f_{ij} + \varepsilon g_{ij}) = {}^t(f_{ij} + \varepsilon g_{ij})^{-1},$$

which gives[1]

$$\sigma^* f_{ij} = {}^t f_{ij}^{-1},$$

[1]Recall that $(f + \varepsilon g)^{-1} = f^{-1} - \varepsilon f^{-1} g f^{-1}$ in $\mathrm{GL}_r(\mathbb{C}[\varepsilon])$, and $\det(f + \varepsilon g) = \det(f)(1 + \varepsilon Tr(f^{-1}g))$.

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma^* g_{ij} = -\,{}^t f_{ij}^{-1}\,{}^t g_{ij}\,{}^t f_{ij}^{-1}\\
\Leftrightarrow\ &\sigma^*\varphi_i\circ\sigma^*\eta_{ij}\circ\sigma^*\varphi_j^{-1} = -\,{}^t\varphi_i^{-1}\circ{}^t\eta_{ij}\circ{}^t\varphi_j\\
\Leftrightarrow\ &\sigma^*\varphi_i\circ\sigma^*\eta_{ij}\circ\sigma^*\varphi_j^{-1} = -\sigma^*\varphi_i\circ\psi^{-1}\circ{}^t\eta_{ij}\circ\psi\circ\sigma^*\varphi_j^{-1}\\
\Leftrightarrow\ &\sigma^*\eta_{ij} = -\psi^{-1}\circ{}^t\eta_{ij}\circ\psi\\
\Leftrightarrow\ &\sigma^*(\eta_{ij}\circ{}^t\psi^{-1}) = -\psi^{-1}\circ{}^t\eta_{ij} = -\,{}^t(\eta_{ij}\circ{}^t\psi^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\eta\circ{}^t\psi^{-1}\in H^1(X, E\otimes\sigma^*E)_-.$$

where $H^1(X, E\otimes\sigma^*E)_-$ is the proper subspace associated to the eigenvalue -1 of the involution of $H^1(X, E\otimes\sigma^*E)$ given by

$$\xi\to\sigma^*({}^t\xi).$$

Consider the case of $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$. Fix a point E of $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$. In this case, $\tilde{\psi}$ can be represented with respect to some frame near each point of X by the matrix

$$J_r = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_r\\ -I_r & 0\end{pmatrix}.$$

Such frame gives a trivialisation $\{\varphi_i\}$ such that

$$(\sigma\times J_r)\circ\sigma^*\varphi_i = {}^t\varphi_i^{-1}\circ\sigma^*\psi,$$

so the assocaited transition functions $\{f_{ij}\}$ verify

$$\sigma^* f_{ij} = -J_r\,{}^t f_{ij}^{-1} J_r.$$

It follows that the deformation $\mathscr{E}$ is in the tangent space $T_E\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$ if an only if we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^*(f_{ij}+\varepsilon g_{ij}) &= -J_r\,{}^t(f_{ij}+\varepsilon g_{ij})^{-1}J_r\\
&= -J_r\,{}^t f_{ij}^{-1}J_r + \varepsilon J_r\,{}^t f_{ij}^{-1}\,{}^t g_{ij}\,{}^t f_{ij}^{-1}J_r.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sigma^*\varphi_i\circ\sigma^*\eta_{ij}\circ\sigma^*\varphi_j^{-1} = J_r\,{}^t\varphi_i^{-1}\circ{}^t\eta_{ij}\circ{}^t\varphi_j J_r\\
&\Leftrightarrow \sigma^*\eta_{ij} = -\psi^{-1}\circ{}^t\eta_{ij}\circ\psi\\
&\Leftrightarrow \sigma^*(\eta_{ij}\circ{}^t\psi^{-1}) = {}^t(\eta_{ij}\circ{}^t\psi^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally

$$\eta\circ{}^t\psi^{-1}\in H^1(X, E\otimes\sigma^*E)_+.$$

We have showed so far

Theorem 3.11. *With the above notations, we have*

(a) *The tangent space to $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ at a point E is isomorphic to $H^1(X, E\otimes\sigma^*E)_-$. In particular we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)) &= \frac{r^2}{2}(g_X-1)+\frac{nr}{2}\\
&= r^2(g_Y-1)+n\frac{r(r+1)}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

(b) *The tangent space to* $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$ *at a point* E *is isomorphic to* $H^1(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E)_+$. *In particular we have*

$$\begin{aligned} dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)) &= \frac{r^2}{2}(g_X - 1) - \frac{nr}{2} \\ &= r^2(g_Y - 1) + n\frac{r(r-1)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We need just to calculate the dimensions. Let E a $\sigma-$anti-invariant stable vector bundle, denote by $F = E \otimes \sigma^* E$. First we have

$$h^1(X, F) = h^1_+ + h^1_- = r^2(g_X - 1) + 1, \tag{3}$$

where we denote for simplicity $h^0_\pm = h^0(X, F)_\pm$, $h^1_\pm = h^1(X, F)_\pm$.
Let $\varsigma : \sigma^* F \to F$ be the canonical linearisation equal to the transposition $(\sigma^*(s \otimes \sigma^* t) \longrightarrow t \otimes \sigma^* s)$.

Using Lefschetz fixed point formula [AB68], one gets

$$h^1_+ - h^1_- = h^0_+ - h^0_- - \sum_{p \in R} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(\varsigma_p)}{\det(id - d_p\sigma)}.$$

It is clear that $d_p\sigma : T_pX \to T_pX$ is equal to $-id$ (see Lemma 3.4), and the trace of the involution $\varsigma_p : F_p \to F_p$ is equal to

$$\dim(F_p)_+ - \dim(F_p)_-.$$

But, $F_p = E_p \otimes E_p = \mathrm{Sym}^2 E_p \oplus \bigwedge^2 E_p$, and $h^0_+ = 1$ if ψ is $\sigma-$symmetric, $h^0_- = 1$ if ψ is $\sigma-$alternating. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} h^1_+ - h^1_- &= -\frac{1}{2}\left(\textstyle\sum_{p \in R} \dfrac{r(r+1)}{2} - \dfrac{r(r-1)}{2}\right) + 1 \\ &= -nr + 1 \qquad \text{if } \psi \text{ is } \sigma-\text{symmetric.} \\ h^1_+ - h^1_- &= -\frac{1}{2}\left(\textstyle\sum_{p \in R} \dfrac{r(r+1)}{2} - \dfrac{r(r-1)}{2}\right) - 1 \\ &= -nr - 1 \qquad \text{if } \psi \text{ is } \sigma-\text{alternating.} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

From 3 and 4, we deduce

$$h^1_- = \frac{r^2}{2}(g_X - 1) + \frac{nr}{2} \quad \text{if } \psi \text{ est } \sigma-\text{symmetric.}$$

$$h^1_+ = \frac{r^2}{2}(g_X - 1) - \frac{nr}{2} \quad \text{if } \psi \text{ est } \sigma-\text{alternating.}$$

The other equalities are consequences of Hurwitz formula. □

Using [Theorem 4.1.6 [BS14]], we get an identification of the moduli stack $\mathrm{Bun}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ (resp. $\mathrm{Bun}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$) of $\sigma-$symmetric (resp. $\sigma-$alternating) anti-invariant vector bundles E, with the moduli stack $\mathrm{Bun}_Y(\mathcal{G})$ of $\mathcal{G}-$torsors over Y, where $\mathcal{G} = \pi_*^\sigma(\mathrm{GL}_r)$ is the invariant direct image of the constant group scheme GL_r over X, where the lifting action of σ on GL_r is given by

$$g \to {}^t g^{-1} \ \ (\text{resp. } J_r\, {}^t g^{-1}\, J_r^{-1}).$$

We can see, using the description of parahoric subgroups given in [BS14], that $\mathcal{G}$ is not a parahoric Bruhat-Tits group scheme (in the sense given in [BS14]). Moreover,

it is not generically constant. This gives a new example of interesting moduli spaces which are not parahoric type.

4. The Hitchin system for anti-invariant vector bundles

For $s \in W$, we denote by $q : \tilde{X}_s \to X$ the associated spectral cover of X, and by $\tilde{S} = Ram(\tilde{X}_s/X)$ its ramification divisor.
Fix the *positive* linearisation on K_X and $\mathcal{O}_X$ (see Remark 3.5). Recall that this linearisation equals *id* over the ramification points. We denote these linearisations by

$$\eta : \sigma^* K_X \to K_X, \quad \nu : \sigma^* \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{O}_X.$$

The linearisation η induces an involution on the space global sections of K_X^i for each $i \geqslant 1$, we define

$$W^{\sigma,+} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} H^0(X, K_X^i)_+.$$

Proposition 4.1. *Consider an $r-$tuple of global sections $s = (s_1, \cdots, s_r) \in W^{\sigma,+}$, and let $\tilde{X}_s$ be the associated spectral curve over X. Then the involution $\sigma : X \to X$ lifts to an involution $\tilde{\sigma}$ on $\tilde{X}_s$, and $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{S})$ descend to $\tilde{Y}_s := \tilde{X}_s/\tilde{\sigma}$.*

Proof. We have an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{O}_X \oplus K_X^{-1} \xrightarrow{{}^t\nu \otimes {}^t\eta} \sigma^*(\mathcal{O}_X \oplus K_X^{-1}),$$

which induces an involution $\bar{\sigma}$ on $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_X \oplus K_X^{-1})$. Let $\tilde{X}_s \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_X \oplus K_X^{-1})$ be the spectral curve associated to s.
Recall that y is defined to be the identity section of $\bar{q}_* \mathcal{O}(1) \cong \mathcal{O}_X \oplus K_X^{-1}$, therefore it is $\bar{\sigma}-$invariant. And x is by definition the canonical section of $\bar{q}^* K_X \otimes \mathcal{O}(1)$. In fact it can be seen as the canonical section of $\bar{q}^* K_X \to |K_X|$, where $|K_X|$ is the total space of K_X. Hence x is invariant with respect to the positive linearisation. As by definition $\eta^{\otimes k}(\sigma^*(s_k)) = s_k$, we deduce that

$$\bar{\sigma}((\bar{q}^* s_k) y^k x^{r-k}) = (\bar{q}^* s_k) y^k x^{r-k}.$$

Thus the section defining $\tilde{X}_s$

$$x^r + (\bar{q}^* s_1) y x^{r-1} + \cdots + (\bar{q}^* s_r) y^r \in H^0(\bar{q}^* K_X^r \otimes \mathcal{O}(r))$$

is $\bar{\sigma}-$invariant. Hence $\bar{\sigma}(\tilde{X}_s) = \tilde{X}_s$, so $\bar{\sigma}$ induces an involution on $\tilde{X}_s$ which we denote by $\tilde{\sigma}$.
Remark that $\bar{\sigma}$ act trivially on the fibres of $\bar{q} : \mathbb{S} \to X$ over the ramification points of $\pi : X \to Y$. Thus the ramification locus of $\tilde{\sigma}$ is $q^{-1}(R)$.

By Hurwitz formula we have $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{S}) = K_{\tilde{X}_s} \otimes q^* K_X^{-1}$. We know by Lemma 3.4 that $K_{\tilde{X}_s}$ (resp. K_X) descends to $\tilde{Y}_s$ (resp. Y). Moreover, $K_{\tilde{X}_s} = \tilde{\pi}^* K_{\tilde{Y}}(\tilde{R})$ (resp. $K_X = \pi^* K_Y(R)$), where $\tilde{R} = Ram(\tilde{X}_s/\tilde{Y}_s)$, and we have used the notation of the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tilde{X}_s & \xrightarrow{q} & X \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \tilde{\pi}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi} \\ \tilde{Y}_s & \xrightarrow{\tilde{q}} & Y, \end{array}$$

as $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{R}) = q^*\mathcal{O}(R)$, it follows

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}(\tilde{S}) &= K_{\tilde{X}_s} \otimes q^* K_X^{-1} \\ &= \tilde{\pi}^* K_{\tilde{Y}_s} \otimes q^*(\pi^* K_Y^{-1}) \otimes \mathcal{O}(\tilde{R}) \otimes q^*\mathcal{O}(-R) \\ &= \tilde{\pi}^* \left(K_{\tilde{Y}_s} \otimes \tilde{q}^* K_Y^{-1}\right).\end{aligned}$$

In particular, by Hurwitz formula, $K_{\tilde{Y}} \otimes \tilde{q}^* K_Y^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(S)$, where $S = Ram(\tilde{Y}_s/Y)$, hence $\mathcal{O}(\tilde{S}) = \tilde{\pi}^*\mathcal{O}(S)$. □

We keep the notations of the last proposition hereafter.

Remark 4.2. Remark that for $s \in W^{\sigma,+}$, $\tilde{Y}_s$ is a spectral cover of Y associated to the line bundle $L = K_Y \otimes \Delta$, because the sections s_i descend to Y.

Lemma 4.3. *Let F be a $\sigma-$invariant vector bundle, and consider the* negative *linearisation on K_X. Then the Serre duality isomorphism*

$$H^1(X, F^*) \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(X, F \otimes K_X)^*$$

is equivariant with respect to the involutions on the two spaces. In particular, it is anti-equivariant with respect to the positive linearisation on K_X.

Proof. If F is a $\sigma-$invariant vector bundle, we have an equivariant perfect pairing:

$$H^0(X, F) \otimes H^1(X, F^* \otimes K_X) \to H^1(X, K_X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C},$$

as the fixed linearisation is the negative one, it follows by Remark 3.5 that

$$\begin{aligned}H^1(X, K_X)_+ &= H^1(X, \pi^*(K_Y \otimes \Delta))_+ \\ &= H^1(Y, K_Y \otimes \Delta \otimes \Delta^{-1}) \\ &= H^1(Y, K_Y) = \mathbb{C}\end{aligned}$$

so

$$H^1(X, K_X) = H^1(X, K_X)_+.$$

As the above pairing is equivarient, we get the result. □

We denote by $\mathscr{H}_i$ the i^{th} component of the Hitchin map $\mathscr{H}_E : H^0(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X) \to W$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let E be $\sigma-$anti-invariant stable vector bundle, and let $\psi : \sigma^* E \cong E^*$ be an isomorphism.*

(1) If ψ is $\sigma-$symmetric, then $\mathscr{H}_i$ induces a map

$$\mathscr{H}_i : H^0(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X)_+ \to H^0(X, K_X^i)_+.$$

(2) If ψ is $\sigma-$alternating, then $\mathscr{H}_i$ induces a map

$$\mathscr{H}_i : H^0(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X)_- \to H^0(X, K_X^i)_+.$$

Proof. Let $\phi \in H^0(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X)$, and let

$$f : H^0(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X) \longrightarrow H^0(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X)$$

be the involution defined by

$$f(\phi) = {}^t(\sigma^* \phi)$$

and f acts by $\alpha \to \eta(\sigma^* \alpha)$ on K_X.

Locally, we can write $\phi = \sum_k s_k \otimes \sigma^*(t_k) \otimes \alpha_k$, where α_k (resp. s_k, t_k) are local sections of K_X (resp. E). We can see the section ϕ as a map $E \to E \otimes K_X$ which is defined locally by

$$x \longrightarrow \phi(x) = \sum_k \langle \psi(\sigma^*(t_k)), x\rangle \, s_k \otimes \alpha_k.$$

Thus $\bigwedge^i \phi$ is defined locally by

$$\begin{aligned}
\bigwedge^i \phi(x_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_i) &= i!\phi(x_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi(x_i) \\
&= i! \left(\sum_{k_1} \langle \psi(\sigma^*(t_{k_1})), x_1\rangle \, s_{k_1} \otimes \alpha_{k_1} \right) \wedge \cdots \wedge \left(\sum_{k_i} \langle \psi(\sigma^*(t_{k_i})), x_i\rangle \, s_{k_i} \otimes \alpha_{k_i} \right) \\
&= i! \sum_{k_1,\ldots,k_i} \langle \psi(\sigma^*(t_{k_1})), x_1\rangle \cdots \langle \psi(\sigma^*(t_{k_i})), x_i\rangle \, s_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge s_{k_i} \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^i \alpha_{k_j} \right) \\
&= i! \sum_{k_1 < \cdots < k_i} \det \left(\left\langle \psi(\sigma^*(t_{k_j})), x_l \right\rangle \right)_{j,l} s_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge s_{k_i} \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^i \alpha_{k_j} \right) \\
&= i! \sum_{k_1 < \cdots < k_i} \left\langle (\bigwedge^i \psi)(\sigma^*(t_{k_1}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \sigma^*(t_{k_i})), x_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_i \right\rangle s_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge s_{k_i} \otimes \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^i \alpha_{k_j} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For the last equality, we use the canonical isomorphism $\bigwedge^k E^* \cong (\bigwedge^k E)^*$ given by the determinant. It follows that (locally) we have

$$\bigwedge^i \phi = i! \sum_{k_1 < \cdots < k_i} s_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge s_{k_i} \otimes \sigma^*(t_{k_1}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \sigma^*(t_{k_i}) \otimes \bigotimes_{j=1}^i \alpha_{k_j}.$$

(1) Suppose that ψ is $\sigma-$symmetric, thus for any local section s and t of E, one has

$$\langle \psi(\sigma^*(t)), s\rangle = \nu(\sigma^* \langle \psi(\sigma^*(s)), t\rangle).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{H}_i(f(\phi)) &= (-1)^i \mathrm{Tr}({}^t(\sigma^*(\bigwedge^i \phi))) \\
&= (-1)^i i! \sum_{k_1 < \cdots < k_i} \left\langle \bigwedge^i \psi(\sigma^*(s_{k_1}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \sigma^*(s_{k_i})), t_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge t_{k_i} \right\rangle \bigotimes_{j=1}^i \eta(\sigma^*(\alpha_{k_j})) \\
&= (-1)^i i! \sum_{k_1 < \cdots < k_i} \det \left(\left\langle \psi(\sigma^*(s_{k_l})), t_{k_{l'}} \right\rangle \right)_{1 \leqslant l,l' \leqslant i} \bigotimes_{j=1}^i \eta(\sigma^*(\alpha_{k_j})) \\
&= (-1)^i i! \sum_{k_1 < \cdots < k_i} \nu \left(\sigma^* \left\langle \bigwedge^i \psi(\sigma^*(t_{k_1}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \sigma^*(t_{k_i})), s_{k_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge s_{k_i} \right\rangle \right) \bigotimes_{j=1}^i \eta(\sigma^*(\alpha_{k_j})) \\
&= \eta^{\otimes i}(\sigma^*(\mathscr{H}_i(\phi))).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $f(\phi) = \phi$, then $\eta^{\otimes i}(\sigma^*(\mathscr{H}_i(\phi))) = \mathscr{H}_i(\phi)$.

(2) If ψ is $\sigma-$alternating, thus

$$\langle \psi(\sigma^*(t)), s\rangle = -\nu(\sigma^* \langle \psi(\sigma^*(s)), t\rangle),$$

by the above calculation, it follows that

$$\mathscr{H}_i(f(\phi)) = (-1)^i \eta^{\otimes i}(\sigma^*(\mathscr{H}_i(\phi))).$$

On the other hand, it is clear that

$$\mathscr{H}_i(-\phi) = (-1)^i \mathscr{H}_i(\phi),$$

so if $f(\phi) = -\phi$, then

$$\eta^{\otimes i}(\sigma^*(\mathscr{H}_i(\phi))) = \mathscr{H}_i(\phi).$$

□

We claim that $\dim(W^{\sigma,+}) = \dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r))$. Indeed we have

$$\begin{aligned} H^0(X, K_X^i) &\cong H^0(Y, \pi_* K_X^i) \\ &= H^0(Y, K_Y^i \otimes \Delta^i) \oplus H^0(Y, K_Y \otimes \Delta^{i-1}). \end{aligned}$$

As the fixed linearisation on K_X is the positive one, by Remark 3.5, we obtain

$$H^0(X, K_X^i)_+ \cong H^0(Y, K_Y^i \otimes \Delta^i),$$

hence

$$h^0(X, K_X^i)_+ = (2i-1)(g_Y - 1) + in,$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(W^{\sigma,+}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{r} (2i-1)(g_Y - 1) + in \\ &= r^2(g_Y - 1) + \frac{r(r+1)}{2} n. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.5. We use Riemann-Roch and Lefschetz fixed point theorem ([AB68]) to calculate the dimension of $W^{\sigma,+}$ by a second method. Two cases should be distinguished (for simplicity of notations, we denote by $h^0_\pm(i)$ the dimension of $H^0(X, K_X^i)_\pm$):

(1) $i = 1$: as the Serre duality is anti-equivariant for the positive linearisation on K_X, we deduce $h^1(X, K_X)_- = h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)_+ = 1$ (see Lemma 4.3). Hence

$$\begin{cases} h^0_+(1) + h^0_-(1) & = g_X \\ h^0_+(1) - h^0_-(1) & = -1 + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{2n} 1 = n - 1 \end{cases}$$

so we get $h^0_+(1) = g_Y - 1 + n$.

(2) $i \geqslant 2$: in this case $H^1(X, K_X^i) = 0$, it follows

$$\begin{cases} h^0_+(i) + h^0_-(i) & = (2i-1)(g_X - 1) \\ h^0_+(i) - h^0_-(i) & = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=1}^{2n} 1 = n \end{cases}$$

hence $h^0_+(i) = \frac{1}{2}\left((2i-1)(g_X - 1) + n\right) = (2i-1)(g_Y - 1) + in.$

Finally, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} h^0(X, K_X^i)_+ = r^2(g_Y - 1) + \frac{r(r+1)}{2}n.$$

To study the irreducibility of $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ and $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$, we will use the notion of *very stable* vector bundles, which has been introduced in [Lau88], but we focus just on stable vector bundles. Let E be a stable vector bundle, and let $\phi : E \to E \otimes K_X$ be a Higgs field. We say that ϕ is *nilpotent* if the composition of the maps

$$E \xrightarrow{\phi} E \otimes K_X \xrightarrow{\phi\otimes id} E \otimes K_X^2 \to \cdots \to E \otimes K_X^{r-1} \xrightarrow{\phi\otimes id} E \otimes K_X^r$$

vanishes.

Definition 4.6. We say that a vector bundle E is *very stable* if E has no nilpotent Higgs field other than 0.

If E is a very stable vector bundle, then the Hitchin morphism

$$\mathscr{H}_E : H^0(X, E \otimes E^* \otimes K_X) \to W$$

is dominant. Indeed, by the very definition, $\mathscr{H}_E^{-1}(0) = \{0\}$, but the two spaces have the same dimension, this implies that $\mathscr{H}_E$ is dominant.

One of the main results of [Lau88] is that the locus of very stable vector bundles is an open dense subscheme of the moduli space of vector bundles.

Definition 4.7. We say that a $\sigma-$symmetric (resp. $\sigma-$alternating) anti-invariant vector bundle E is *very stable* if E has no nilpotent Higgs field

$$\phi \in H^0(E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X)_+ \ \ (\text{ resp. } \phi \in H^0(E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X)_-)$$

other than 0.

Let $T^*\mathcal{U}_X(r,0)$ be the cotangent bundle of $\mathcal{U}_X(r,0)$. This bundle is invariant with respect to the involution $E \to \sigma^* E^*$ on $\mathcal{U}_X(r,0)$. In fact, this is true more generally for any variety Z with an involution σ. To see this consider the differential of σ, it gives a linear isomorphism

$$d\sigma : TZ \longrightarrow \sigma^* TZ,$$

but $\sigma^2 = id_Z$, this implies that $d\sigma \circ \sigma^* d\sigma = id$. Thus $d\sigma$ is a linearisation on TZ, hence $d\sigma^t$ is a linearisation on T^*Z.

In particular, in our case, the involution $E \to \sigma^* E^*$ of $\mathcal{U}_X(r,0)$ lifts to an involution on $T^*\mathcal{U}_X(r,0)$. If we identify $T^*_E\mathcal{U}_X(r,0) \cong H^1(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E)$ using $\psi : \sigma^* E \cong E^*$, then the derivative of this involution is the involution f on $H^1(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E)$ given by $f(\phi) = {}^t(\sigma^*\phi)$ in the $\sigma-$symmetric case, and $f(\phi) = -{}^t(\sigma^*\phi)$ in the $\sigma-$alternating case.
Moreover, by §3.2.2, the fixed locus of this involution is the cotangent bundles $T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ (resp. $T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$). Hence we can consider both $T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\pm}(r)$ as closed subspaces of $T^*\mathcal{U}_X(r,0)$. Moreover, the tautological symplectic form on $T^*\mathcal{U}_X(r,0)$ restricts to the tautological forms on $T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\pm}(r)$.

Following the notations of [Lau88], let $\Lambda_{X,r} \subset T^*\mathcal{U}_X(r,0)$ the nilpotent cone, that's the set of (E,ϕ) with ϕ nilpotent Higgs field. Set

$$\Lambda_{X,r}^{\sigma,+} = \Lambda_{X,r} \cap T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)\,,\ \Lambda_{X,r}^{\sigma,-} = \Lambda_{X,r} \cap T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r).$$

Theorem 4.8. *The nilpotent cone $\Lambda^{\sigma,+}_{X,r}$ (resp. $\Lambda^{\sigma,-}_{X,r}$) is Lagrangian in $T^*\mathcal{U}^{\sigma,+}_X(r)$ (resp. $T^*\mathcal{U}^{\sigma,-}_X(r)$). In particular the locus of very stable anti-invariant vector bundles is dense in $\mathcal{U}^{\sigma,+}_X(r)$ (resp. $\mathcal{U}^{\sigma,-}_X(r)$)*

Proof. We prove the $\sigma-$symmetric case, the $\sigma-$alternating is absolutely the same. If V is symplectic space, then the restriction of a Lagrangian subspace $L \subset V$ to a symplectic subspace $F \subset V$ is an isotropic subspace of F, this implies that $\Lambda^{\sigma,+}_{X,r}$ is an isotropic subspace of $T^*\mathcal{U}^{\sigma,+}_X(r)$, in particular its dimension is at most $\dim(\mathcal{U}^{\sigma,+}_X(r))$. But it is clear that $\mathcal{U}^{\sigma,+}_X(r) \subset \Lambda^{\sigma,+}_{X,r}$, by seeing any anti-invariant vector bundle E as the trivial pair $(E,0) \in \Lambda^{\sigma,+}_{X,r}$. This implies that

$$\dim(\Lambda^{\sigma,+}_{X,r}) = \frac{1}{2}\dim(T^*\mathcal{U}^{\sigma,+}_X(r)),$$

hence $\Lambda^{\sigma,+}_{X,r}$ is Lagrangian of $T^*\mathcal{U}^{\sigma,+}_X(r)$. □

4.1. **$\sigma-$symmetric case.**

4.1.1. *The ramified case.* Suppose that $\pi : X \to Y$ is ramified. Denote by $m = r(r-1)(g_X-1)$, recall that $\deg(\tilde{S}) = 2m$. For general $s \in W^{\sigma,+}$ consider the subvariety $\mathcal{P}^+ \subset \mathrm{Pic}^m(\tilde{X}_s)$ of isomorphism classes of line bundles L such that

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Nm}}(L) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}_s}(S),$$

where $S = Ram(\tilde{Y}_s/Y)$, and $\widetilde{\mathrm{Nm}} : \mathrm{Pic}^0(\tilde{X}_s) \to \mathrm{Pic}^0(\tilde{Y}_s)$ the norm map attached to $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{X}_s \to \tilde{Y}_s$.
By Proposition 4.1, $\tilde{\pi}^*\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}_s}(S) = \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_s}(\tilde{S})$, it follows that for each $L \in \mathcal{P}^+$, we have

$$\tilde{\sigma}^*L \cong L^{-1}(\tilde{S}).$$

In particular any $M \in \mathcal{P}^+$ gives by translation an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{P}^+ \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Prym}(\tilde{X}_s/\tilde{Y}_s).$$

Lemma 4.9. *For general $s \in W^{\sigma,+}$, we have*

$$dim(\mathcal{P}^+) = dim(\mathcal{U}^{\sigma,+}_X(r)).$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, for general $s \in W^{\sigma,+}$, the curve $\tilde{X}_s$ is smooth and its genus is $g_{\tilde{X}_s} = r^2(g_X-1)+1$. Moreover, if $\tilde{X}_s$ is smooth then $\tilde{R}$ has no multiple points (reduced divisor). Indeed, if $a \in \tilde{R}$ is a multiple point over $p \in R$, then we claim that a is singular point of $\tilde{X}_s$, to see this let t be a local parameter in a neighbourhood of p. Then $\tilde{X}_s$ is given locally over p by the equation

$$P(x,t) = x^r + s_1(t)x^{r-1} + \cdots + s_r(t) = 0.$$

In particular, because a is multiple point, we have

$$P(a,0) = \frac{\partial P}{\partial x}(a,0) = 0.$$

Now, as $s_i \in H^0(X, K_X^i)_+$, it follows that $s_i(-t) = s_i(t)$, so for each i, we can write locally near p

$$s_i(t) = a_0 + t^2 a_2 + \cdots .$$

This implies that $P(x,t) = P_0(x) + t^2P_2(x) + \cdots$, where P_i are polynomials in x. Hence

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial t}(a,0) = 0.$$

By the Jacobian criterion of smoothness, we deduce that $\tilde{X}_s$ is singular at a. And it is clear that $\deg(\tilde{R}) = 2rn$, so we get

$$\begin{aligned}\dim(\mathcal{P}^+) &= g_{\tilde{X}_s} - g_{\tilde{Y}_s} \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(g_{\tilde{X}_s} - 1 + rn) \qquad \text{(by Riemann-Roch)} \\ &= \frac{r^2}{2}(g_X - 1) + \frac{rn}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 4.10. We can calculate $\dim(\mathcal{P}^+)$ differently. By Remark 4.2, $\tilde{Y}_s$ is spectral curve over Y, hence for general $s \in W^{\sigma,+}$ (such that $\tilde{Y}_s$ is smooth), we have

$$\begin{aligned}g_{\tilde{Y}_s} &= \deg(K_Y \otimes \Delta)\frac{r(r-1)}{2} + r(g_Y - 1) + 1 \\ &= r^2(g_Y - 1) + \frac{r(r-1)}{2}n + 1.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\dim(\mathcal{P}^+) &= g_{\tilde{X}_s} - g_{\tilde{Y}_s} \\ &= r^2(g_X - 1) + 1 - r^2(g_Y - 1) - \frac{r(r-1)}{2}n - 1 \\ &= r^2(g_Y - 1) + \frac{r(r+1)}{2}n.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 4.11. *Suppose that $\pi : X \to Y$ is ramified. Then for general $s \in W^{\sigma,+}$, the rational pushforward map*

$$q_* : \mathcal{P}^+ \dashrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$$

is dominant. In particular $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ is irreducible.

Proof. First, by the duality for finite flat morphisms, this map is well defined, more precisely, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^* q_* L &\cong q_*(\tilde{\sigma}^* L) \\ &\cong q_*(L^{-1} \otimes \mathcal{O}(\tilde{S})) \\ &\cong (q_* L)^*,\end{aligned}$$

the last isomorphism is the duality for finite flat morphisms (see for example Ex III.6.10, [Har77]). The isomorphism $\psi : \sigma^*(q_*L) \to (q_*L)^*$ is defined using the the pairing $\tilde{\psi} : q_*L \otimes \sigma^*(q_*L) \to \mathcal{O}_X$, which is defined as follows: for $v, w \in H^0(U, q_*L) = H^0(q^{-1}(U), L)$, we put

$$\tilde{\psi}(v \otimes \tilde{\sigma}^* w) \cdot \xi = \langle v, \tilde{\sigma}^* w \rangle,$$

where $\xi \in H^0(\tilde{X}_s, \mathcal{O}(\tilde{S}))$ is the canonical section equals the derivative of $q : \tilde{X}_s \to X$, and $\langle , \rangle : L \otimes \tilde{\sigma}^* L \to \mathcal{O}(\tilde{S})$ is an isomorphism. Moreover, $\tilde{\psi}$ is $\sigma-$symmetric because $L \in \mathcal{P}^+$ (see Lemma 3.9). In fact, as π is assumed to be ramified, there is no $\tilde{\sigma}-$alternating line bundle on $\tilde{X}_s$. Conversely, given a $\sigma-$symmetric anti-invariant stable vector bundle E and $\phi \in H^0(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X)_+$ such that $\mathscr{H}_E(\phi) = s$,

then the corresponding line bundle over $\tilde{X}_s$ is in $\mathcal{P}^+$, to see this consider the exact sequence (see [BNR89], Remark 3.7)

$$0 \to L(-\tilde{S}) \longrightarrow q^*(E) \xrightarrow{q^*\phi - x} q^*(E \otimes K_X) \longrightarrow L \otimes q^* K_X \to 0. \tag{5}$$

By taking the dual, pulling-back by $\tilde{\sigma}$ and than tensorizing by $\tilde{\sigma}^* q^* K_X$, we get the exact sequence

(6)

$$0 \to \tilde{\sigma}^*(L^{-1}) \to \tilde{\sigma}^* q^*(E^*) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\sigma}^*({}^t(q^*\phi)) - \tilde{\sigma}^* x} \tilde{\sigma}^*(q^*(E^* \otimes K_X)) \to \tilde{\sigma}^*(L^{-1}(\tilde{S}) \otimes q^* K_X) \to 0$$

As ϕ is invariant: ${}^t(\sigma^*\phi) = \phi$, the middle maps of the exact sequences (5) and (6) are identified using the isomorphism $\psi : \sigma^* E \to E^*$, hence they have isomorphic kernels. This implies that

$$L(-\tilde{S}) \cong \tilde{\sigma}^*(L^{-1}).$$

Thus $L \in \mathcal{P}^+$.

By Lemma 4.9 we deduce that whenever $\tilde{X}_s$ is smooth we have $\dim(\mathcal{P}^+) = \dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r))$.
Now, if $E \in \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ is very stable then the map

$$\mathscr{H}_E : H^0(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X)_+ \to W^{\sigma,+}$$

is dominant, it follows that the map

$$\Pi : T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r) \times W^{\sigma,+}$$

is dominant too, because the locus of very stable vector bundles is dense inside $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ by Theorem 4.8. In particular, fixing a general $s \in W^{\sigma,+}$, we obtain a dominant morphism

$$\mathscr{H}^{-1}(s) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r),$$

where $\mathscr{H} : T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r) \to W^{\sigma,+}$ is the Hitchin morphism. But, by Proposition 2.4, $(E, \phi) \in \mathscr{H}^{-1}(s)$ iff $E \cong q_* L$ for some $L \in \mathcal{P}^+$. Hence we deduce that

$$q_* : \mathcal{P}^+ \dashrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$$

is dominant.

As $\tilde{R} = q^{-1}(R)$, one deduces that $\tilde{X}_s \to \tilde{Y}_s$ is ramified. This implies the connectedness of $\mathcal{P}^+$, hence $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ is irreducible. □

4.1.2. *The étale case.* Assume that the cover $\pi : X \to Y$ is étale. In this case, any $\sigma-$invariant vector bundle over X descends to Y by Kempf's Lemma. In particular, we have

$$K_X = \pi^*(K_Y \otimes \Delta) = \pi^* K_Y.$$

The linearisation on K_X attached to $K_Y \otimes \Delta$ is called the *positive* linearisation. Recall that Serre duality is anti-equivariant with respect to this linearisation because, by Remark 3.5, we have

$$h^1(X, K_X)_- = h^1(Y, \pi^*(K_Y \otimes \Delta))_- = h^1(Y, K_Y) = 1,$$

(see the proof of Proposition 4.3 for more details).

Theorem 4.12. *Suppose that $\pi : X \to Y$ is étale, then the pushforward rational map q_* induce a dominant map*

$$q_* : \mathcal{P}^+ \dashrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r).$$

In particular $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ has two connected components.

Proof. Clearly $\tilde{X}_s \to \tilde{Y}_s$ is étale if and only if $X \to Y$ is, hence $\mathcal{P}^+$ has two connected components. We show that it is impossible to produce the same stable vector bundle E as the direct image of two line bundles from the two connected components of $\mathcal{P}^+$. To see this assume that we have L and L', two line bundles each from a connected component of $\mathcal{P}^+$, such that $q_*L \cong q_*L' \in \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$. Let M be a line bundle on $\tilde{X}_s$ such that M descends to $\tilde{Y}_s$ and $M^2 \cong \mathcal{O}(\tilde{S})$. Let κ be a an even theta characteristic on $\tilde{X}_s$ such that $M^{-1} \otimes \kappa$ is the pullback of a theta characteristic κ' on Y, i.e $M^{-1} \otimes \kappa = q^*(\pi^*(\kappa'))$, note that such a pair (M, κ) exists by Lemma 4.13 below. Then, by [BL04], Theorem 12.6.2, we know that

$$h^0(\tilde{X}_s, L \otimes M^{-1} \otimes \kappa) \equiv 0 \mod 2, \;\; h^0(\tilde{X}_s, L' \otimes M^{-1} \otimes \kappa) \equiv 1 \mod 2$$

Using the projection formula, this gives

$$h^0(X, q_*L \otimes \pi^*\kappa') \equiv 0 \mod 2 \text{ and } h^0(X, q_*L' \otimes \pi^*\kappa') \equiv 1 \mod 2$$

a contradiction.

Moreover, if $E \in \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$, then the associated line bundle L over $\tilde{X}_s$ constructed in the proof of Theorem 4.11, verifies $\tilde{\sigma}^*L \cong L^{-1}(\tilde{S})$, this implies that either $\widetilde{\mathrm{Nm}}(L) = \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}_s}(S)$, or $\widetilde{\mathrm{Nm}}(L) = \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}_s}(S) \otimes \tilde{\Delta}$, where $\tilde{\Delta} = \det(\tilde{\pi}_*\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_s})^{-1}$, because $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{X}_s \to \tilde{Y}_s$ is étale. But ψ induces a $\tilde{\sigma}-$invariant isomorphism $\tilde{\sigma}^*L \to L^{-1}(\tilde{S})$, hence $L \otimes M^{-1}$ is $\tilde{\sigma}-$symmetric line bundle on $\tilde{X}_s$, thus by Lemma 3.9 $\widetilde{\mathrm{Nm}}(L) = \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{Y}_s}(S)$. So $L \in \mathcal{P}^+$.
Now the image of the rational map $q_* : \mathcal{P}^+ \to \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}$ has two connected components, which are dense, and by Mumford [Mum71], the map

$$E \to h^0(X, \pi_*E \otimes \kappa')$$

is constant under deformation of E. Hence $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ can't be irreducible. It follows that it has two connected components. □

Lemma 4.13. *Suppose that $\pi : X \to Y$ is étale and $\tilde{X}_s$ is smooth. Then there exist an even theta characteristic κ on $\tilde{X}_s$, and a line bundle M, that descends to $\tilde{Y}_s$, and verifies $M^2 \cong \mathcal{O}(\tilde{S})$, such that $M^{-1} \otimes \kappa$ descends to a theta characteristic on Y.*

Proof. Denote by $\tilde{\Delta} := \det\left(\tilde{\pi}_*\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_s}\right)^{-1}$, note that $\tilde{\Delta}$ is non trivial $2-$torsion line bundle. By [BL04], page 382, we know that there exists an even theta characteristic, say κ'', on $\tilde{Y}_s$ such that

$$h^0(\kappa'') \equiv h^0(\kappa'' \otimes \tilde{\Delta}^{-1}) \equiv 0 \mod 2,$$

if we set $\kappa = \tilde{\pi}^*\kappa''$, we get by the projection formula

$$h^0(\kappa) = h^0(\kappa'') + h^0(\kappa'' \otimes \tilde{\Delta}^{-1}) \equiv 0 \mod 2,$$

hence κ is even theta characteristic. Moreover, let N be a line bundle on $\tilde{Y}_s$ such that $N^2 \cong \mathcal{O}(S)$ (recall that $S := Ram(\tilde{q} : \tilde{Y}_s \to Y)$ has an even degree), then by

Hurwitz formula, we have

$$(N^{-1}\otimes\kappa'')^2=(\tilde{q}^*\kappa')^2,$$

where κ' is a (any) theta characteristic on Y. It follows that there exist a $2-$torsion line bundle α on $\tilde{Y}_s$ such that

$$N^{-1}\otimes\kappa''\otimes\alpha=\tilde{q}^*\kappa'.$$

It suffices to take $M=\tilde{\pi}^*(N\otimes\alpha^{-1})$. □

Remark 4.14. The determinant induces a morphism $\det:\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)\to P=\mathrm{Nm}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_Y)$. The composition of this map with the direct image q_* gives a map

$$\mathcal{P}^+\longrightarrow P,$$

and each connected component of $\mathcal{P}^+$ dominate a connected component of P. One can deduce that this map is surjective, in particular this implies that for general line bundle L in both connected components of $\mathcal{P}^+$, q_*L is stable.

4.1.3. *Trivial determinant.* Denote by $\mathcal{Q}^+=\mathrm{Nm}^{-1}_{\tilde{X}_s/X}(\delta)$, where $\delta=(\det(q_*\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_s}))^{-1}$. For general $s\in W^{\sigma,+}$, $\mathcal{Q}^+$ is isomorphic to the Prym variety of spectral cover $\tilde{X}_s\to X$, in particular it is connected.

Proposition 4.15. *For general $s\in W^{\sigma,+}$, $\mathcal{P}^+\cap\mathcal{Q}^+$ is connected.*

Proof. Fixing an element in $\mathcal{P}^+\cap\mathcal{Q}^+$ gives (by translation) an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{P}\cap\mathcal{Q}\xrightarrow{\sim}\mathcal{P}^+\cap\mathcal{Q}^+.$$

So it is sufficient to count the connected components of $\mathcal{P}\cap\mathcal{Q}$ (recall that $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{Q}$ are the Prym varieties of $\tilde{\pi}:\tilde{X}_s\to\tilde{Y}_s$ and $q:\tilde{X}_s\to X$ respectively). The norm map $\widetilde{\mathrm{Nm}}:J_{\tilde{X}_s}\to J_{\tilde{Y}_s}$ induces a homomorphism

$$\vartheta:\mathcal{Q}\to\underline{\mathcal{Q}},$$

which is just the restriction of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Nm}}$ to $\mathcal{Q}$, here $\underline{\mathcal{Q}}$ is the Prym variety of $\tilde{q}:\tilde{Y}_s\to Y$. We have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mathcal{Q} & \hookrightarrow & J_{\tilde{X}_s} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \widehat{J_{\tilde{X}_s}} & \twoheadrightarrow & \widehat{\mathcal{Q}} \\
\uparrow{\scriptstyle\mu} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle\tilde{\pi}^*} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle\widehat{\widetilde{\mathrm{Nm}}}} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle\hat{\vartheta}} \\
\underline{\mathcal{Q}} & \hookrightarrow & J_{\tilde{Y}_s} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \widehat{J_{\tilde{Y}_s}} & \twoheadrightarrow & \widehat{\underline{\mathcal{Q}}},
\end{array}$$

where $\mu:\underline{\mathcal{Q}}\to\mathcal{Q}$ is the morphism defined by the factorization

$$\tilde{\pi}^*|_{\underline{\mathcal{Q}}}:\underline{\mathcal{Q}}\xrightarrow{\mu}\mathcal{Q}\hookrightarrow J_{\tilde{X}_s}.$$

We obtain the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{Q} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}} & \widehat{\mathcal{Q}} \\
\uparrow{\scriptstyle\mu} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle\hat{\vartheta}} \\
\underline{\mathcal{Q}} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\underline{\mathcal{Q}}}} & \widehat{\underline{\mathcal{Q}}},
\end{array}\tag{7}$$

where $\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}}:\mathcal{Q}\to\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}$ (resp. $\varphi_{\underline{\mathcal{Q}}}:\underline{\mathcal{Q}}\to\widehat{\underline{\mathcal{Q}}}$) is the restriction of the principal polarisation of $J_{\tilde{X}_s}$ (resp. $J_{\tilde{Y}_s}$) to $\mathcal{Q}$ (resp. $\underline{\mathcal{Q}}$). By [PH09], we deduce that the degree of

these two restrictions is r^{2g_X} and r^{2g_Y} respectively (Moreover, as the spectral covers are always ramified, the types of these two polarisations are $(1,\dots,1,\underbrace{r,\dots,r}_{g_X})$ and $(1,\dots,1,\underbrace{r,\dots,r}_{g_Y})$ respectively, see [BNR89], Remark 2.7).

Assume that $X \to Y$ is ramified. Then μ is injective. By Diagram (7) it follows that

$$\mathrm{card}(\mathrm{Ker}(\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}} \circ \mu)) = \mathrm{card}(\mathrm{Ker}(\varphi_{\underline{\mathcal{Q}}} \circ \hat{\vartheta})).$$

It is easy to see that $\mathrm{card}(\mathrm{Ker}(\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}} \circ \mu)) = r^{2g_Y}$. Indeed if $L \in \mathrm{Ker}(\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}} \circ \mu)$, then $\tilde{\pi}^* L = q^* M$ for some $M \in J_X[r]$, but this implies that M descends to Y (here we use Kempf Lemma 3.3 to prove that if q^*M descend to $\tilde{Y}_s$ then M descends to Y), hence $L = \tilde{q}^* N$ for some $N \in J_Y[r]$, i.e. $\mathrm{Ker}(\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}} \circ \mu) = \tilde{q}^* J_Y[r]$, as $\tilde{q}^*$ is injective (c.f. [BNR89], remark 3.10) this implies the result.
But we also have $\mathrm{card}(\mathrm{Ker}(\varphi_{\underline{\mathcal{Q}}})) = r^{2g_Y}$, because $\varphi_{\underline{\mathcal{Q}}}$ has degree r^{2g_Y}. This proves that $\hat{\vartheta}$ is injective. By general theory of abelian varieties (see for example [BL04]), $\mathrm{Ker}(f)$ and $\mathrm{Ker}\ (\hat{f})$ have the same number of connected components for any surjective $f : A \to B$ between abelian varieties. As ϑ is clearly surjective, it follows that $\mathrm{Ker}(\vartheta)$ is connected, and by definition, the kernel of ϑ is $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}$.
If $X \to Y$ is étale, then so is $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{X}_s \to \tilde{Y}_s$. In this case μ has degree 2. Let $L \in \mathrm{Ker}(\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}} \circ \mu)$, then as above $\tilde{\pi}^* L = q^* M$, for some $M \in J_X[r]$, hence M descends to Y, say $M = \pi^* N$, as $M^r = \mathcal{O}_X$, we get $N^r = \mathcal{O}_Y$ or $N^r = \Delta$, denote the set of r^{th} roots of Δ by T. It follows that $L = \tilde{q}^* N$ or $L = \tilde{q}^* N \otimes \tilde{\Delta}$ for $N \in J_Y[r] \cup T$. But $L \in \underline{\mathcal{Q}}$, so

- if r is even, then multiplication by Δ is an involution of $J_Y[r]$ and T, so $L \in \tilde{q}^* J_Y[r]$ (because $\tilde{q}^* T \cap \underline{\mathcal{Q}} = \emptyset$). This implies that $\mathrm{Ker}(\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}} \circ \mu) = \tilde{q}^* J_Y[r]$, hence $\mathrm{card}(\mathrm{Ker}(\varphi_{\mathcal{Q}} \circ \mu)) = 2^{2g_Y}$. It follows that that $\hat{\vartheta}$ is injective. So $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}$ is connected.
- If r is odd, then multiplication by Δ is an isomorphism $J_Y[r] \cong T$, hence $L = \tilde{q}^* N \otimes \tilde{\Delta} \notin \underline{\mathcal{Q}}$ for $N \in J_Y[r]$. Hence $L \in \tilde{q}^* J_Y[r]$, and so we obtain again the connectedness of $\mathcal{P} \cap \mathcal{Q}$.

□

Theorem 4.16. *The pushforward*

$$q_* : \mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathcal{Q}^+ \dashrightarrow \mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$$

is dominant rational map. In particular $\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ is irreducible.

Proof. Let P be the Prym variety of $X \to Y$, then it is clear that the map

$$\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(r) \times P \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_{X,0}^{\sigma,+}(r)$$

is surjective, where $\mathcal{U}_{X,0}^{\sigma,+}(r)$ is the connected component of $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$ which is over P_0 by the determinent map. It follows by Theorem 4.11 that for general $E \in \mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$, there exists $L \in \mathcal{P}^+$ such that $q_* L = E$, as

$$\det(q_* L) = \delta^{-1} \otimes \mathrm{Nm}_{\tilde{X}_s/X}(L),$$

where $\delta = \det(q_* \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_s})^{-1}$, it follows that $\mathrm{Nm}_{\tilde{X}_s/X}(L) = \delta$, hence $L \in \mathcal{Q}^+$. Now by Proposition 4.15, $\mathcal{P}^+ \cap \mathcal{Q}^+$ is connected. This ends the proof. □

Remark 4.17. Remark that the map

$$\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(r) \times P \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$$

is surjective, unless $\pi : X \to Y$ is étale and r is even, for which its image is one connected component.

4.2. $\sigma-$**alternating case.**

4.2.1. *The ramified case.* Suppose that $\pi : X \to Y$ is ramified, and r is even. Let E be a $\sigma-$alternating stable vector bundle, denote by f the involution on $H^0(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X)$ defined by

$$\phi \longrightarrow f(\phi) = {}^t(\sigma^*\phi),$$

and f acts by $\alpha \to \eta(\sigma^*\alpha)$ on K_X. Let $\phi \in H^0(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X)_-$. Using the isomorphism $\psi : \sigma^* E \cong E^*$, we can see ϕ as a map $E \to E \otimes K_X$ (in fact we just identify ϕ and $\phi \circ ({}^t\psi)$ to simplify the notations). Then we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \sigma^*\phi : & \sigma^* E & \longrightarrow & \sigma^* E \otimes \sigma^* K_X \\ & {\scriptstyle \psi^{-1}}\uparrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi\otimes\eta} \\ {}^t\phi : & E^* & \longrightarrow & E^* \otimes K_X, \end{array}$$

Indeed, write (locally)

$$\phi = \sum_k s_k \otimes \sigma^* t_k \otimes \alpha_k,$$

and let v be a local section of E^*, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi \otimes \eta) \circ (\sigma^*\phi) \circ \psi^{-1}(v) &= (\psi \otimes \eta) \left(\sum_k \left\langle (\sigma^*\psi)(t_k), \psi^{-1}(v) \right\rangle \sigma^* s_k \otimes \sigma^* \alpha_k \right) \\ &= (\psi \otimes \eta) \left(\sum_k - \left\langle ({}^t\psi)(t_k), \psi^{-1}(v) \right\rangle \sigma^* s_k \otimes \sigma^* \alpha_k \right) \\ &= -(\psi \otimes \eta) \left(\sum_k \langle t_k, v \rangle \sigma^* s_k \otimes \sigma^* \alpha_k \right) \\ &= -\sum_k \langle t_k, v \rangle \psi(\sigma^* s_k) \otimes \eta(\sigma^* \alpha_k) \\ &= -\left(\sum_k t_k \otimes \psi(\sigma^* s_k) \otimes \eta(\sigma^* \alpha_k) \right)(v) \\ &= -{}^t f(\phi)(v) \\ &= {}^t\phi(v). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$ {}^t\phi = (\psi \otimes \eta) \circ (\sigma^*\phi) \circ \psi^{-1}. \tag{8}$$

In particular, over a ramification point $p \in R$, we have

$$ {}^t\phi_p = \psi_p \cdot \phi_p \cdot \psi_p^{-1}. \tag{9}$$

Lemma 4.18. *Let J_r be the anti-diagonal matrix of the form*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_{r/2} \\ -I_{r/2} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $I_{r/2}$ is the identity matrix, and let $\mathcal{A}$ the set of matrices A such that ${}^tA = J_rAJ_r^{-1}$. Then the characteristic polynomial on $\mathcal{A}$ that sends A to $\chi(A)$ is a perfect square polynomial in the coefficients of A. In particular $det(A)$ is square too.

Proof. Let $B = A - \lambda I_r$, then

$${}^tB = {}^tA - \lambda I_r = J_r(A - \lambda I_r)J_r^{-1} = J_rBJ_r^{-1},$$

it follows that ${}^t(J_rB) = -J_rB$, hence J_rB is anti-symmetric matrix, thus

$$\chi(A) = \det(B) = \det(J_rB) = \mathrm{pf}(J_rB)^2,$$

where $\mathrm{pf}(M)$ denote the Pfaffian of M. □

For $s \in W^{\sigma,+}$, and $p \in X$, let

$$P(x,p) = x^r + s_1(p)x^{r-1} + \cdots + s_r(p).$$

Define

$$W^{\sigma,-} = \{s \in W^{\sigma,+} \mid P(x,p) \text{ is square for all } p \in R\}.$$

Proposition 4.19. *The Hitchin morphism induces a map*

$$T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r) \longrightarrow W^{\sigma,-}.$$

Moreover, for each $s \in W^{\sigma,-}$, the associated spectral curve $\tilde{X}_s$ is singular, and for general $s \in W^{\sigma,-}$, the singular locus of $\tilde{X}_s$ is exactly $\tilde{R}$ and we have $\tilde{R} \subset \tilde{S}$.

Proof. The first part follows directly from equation (9) and Lemma 4.18.
Using the proof of Lemma 4.9, we deduce that for any $s \in W^{\sigma,-}$, the associated spectral curve $\tilde{X}_s$ is singular at every point of $\tilde{R}$.

To see that $\tilde{R} \subset \tilde{S}$, recall that by [BNR89], Remark 3.3, the discriminant of the polynomial

$$x^r + q^*s_1x^{r-1} + \cdots + q^*s_r$$

gives the divisor of ramification $\tilde{S} = Ram(\tilde{X}_s/X)$, in other words, a point $a \in \tilde{X}_s$ (over $p \in X$) is in $\tilde{S}$ if and only if a is a multiple root of $P(x,p)$. Hence we deduce $\tilde{R} \subset \tilde{S}$. □

Remark 4.20. One can deduce directly that $\tilde{X}_s$ is not smooth, for any $s \in W^{\sigma,+}$, using Lemma 3.1. Indeed, this lemma implies that the fixed locus of an involution on smooth curve is smooth, hence reduced (if it is not empty).

It is clear that $W^{\sigma,-}$ is not a linear subspace of $W^{\sigma,+}$. So this system is not integrable in the sense of Hitchin [Hit87].

Moreover, for general $s \in W^{\sigma,-}$, over each $p \in R$, the polynomial

$$x^r + s_1(p)x^{r-1} + \cdots + s_r(p)$$

is a perfect square of a polynomial with *simple roots*. Thus the singularities are generically ordinary double points. The condition that the polynomial $P(x,p)$ is a

perfect square of a polynomial with simple roots is given by $r/2$ equations, hence it decreases the dimension of $W^{\sigma,+}$ by $r/2$, for each $p \in R$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\dim(W^{\sigma,-}) &= \dim(W^{\sigma,+}) - 2n\frac{r}{2}\\ &= \frac{r^2}{2}(g_X - 1) + \frac{nr}{2} - nr\\ &= \frac{r^2}{2}(g_X - 1) - \frac{nr}{2}\\ &= \dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)).\end{aligned}$$

Let $s \in W^{\sigma,-}$ be general such that the singular locus of $\tilde{X}_s$ is $\tilde{R}$ and all singularities are nodes. Denote by $\mathfrak{q} : \hat{X}_s \to \tilde{X}_s$ its normalisation, then the genus $g_{\hat{X}_s}$ of $\hat{X}_s$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}g_{\hat{X}_s} &= (\text{arithmetic genus of } \tilde{X}_s) - (\text{number of singular points})\\ &= r^2(g_X - 1) + 1 - \frac{1}{2}\deg(\tilde{R})\\ &= r^2(g_X - 1) + 1 - rn.\end{aligned}$$

The involution $\tilde{\sigma}$ on $\tilde{X}_s$ lifts to an involution $\hat{\sigma}$ on $\hat{X}_s$ which has no fixed points ($\hat{\sigma}$ interchanges the two points over each singular point). Indeed, if t is local parameter near $p \in R$ and x is a local parameter in a neighbourhood of a ramification point $\lambda \in \tilde{R}$ over p, then by definition, $\tilde{\sigma}$ send $t \to -t$ and $x \to x$, and we can write the equation of $\tilde{X}_s$ near λ as

$$x^2 + t^2 + (\text{higher terms}),$$

then it is clear that $\tilde{\sigma}$ interchange the two tangent lines at this singular point. Thus it interchanges the two branches of $\tilde{X}_s$ over λ.



Thus, if $\hat{\pi} : \hat{X}_s \to \hat{Y}_s := \hat{X}_s/\hat{\sigma}$, and $\mathcal{P} = \mathrm{Prym}(\hat{X}_s/\hat{Y}_s)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\dim(\mathcal{P}) &= g_{\hat{X}_s/\hat{\sigma}} - 1 \qquad (\hat{\sigma} \text{ is étale})\\ &= \frac{1}{2}(g_{\hat{X}_s} - 1) \qquad (\text{Riemann-Roch})\\ &= \frac{r^2}{2}(g_X - 1) - \frac{rn}{2}\\ &= \dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}).\end{aligned}$$

Denote by $\tilde{q} : \hat{Y}_s \to Y$. Let $S' = Ram(\hat{Y}_s/Y)$, and $\hat{\Delta} = \det(\hat{\pi}_*\mathcal{O}_{\hat{X}_s})^{-1}$. As before, the line bundles L on $\hat{X}_s$ such that

$$\hat{\sigma}^*L \cong L^{-1}(\hat{S}),$$

with a $\hat{\sigma}-$alternating isomorphism are those with norm (with respect to $\hat{\pi}$) equals $\mathcal{O}(S') \otimes (\tilde{q}^*\Delta^{-1}) \otimes \hat{\Delta}$. We denote this subvariety of line bundles by $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$. Remark that

$$\mathcal{O}(\hat{S}) = \mathfrak{q}^*\mathcal{O}(\tilde{S} - \tilde{R}).$$

By the same method as in Theorem 4.11 we get

Theorem 4.21. *Suppose that $X \to Y$ is ramified. For general $s \in W^{\sigma,-}$, the pushforward*

$$\hat{q}_* : \hat{\mathcal{P}} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$$

is dominant. In particular $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$ has two irreducible components.

Proof. As in Theorem 4.11, we deduce that this map is well defined. Moreover, using Theorem 4.8, we deduce that the map:

$$\Pi : T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r) \to \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r) \times W^{\sigma,-}$$

is dominant. Hence, for general $s \in W^{\sigma,-}$, we get a dominant

$$\mathscr{H}^{-1}(s) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r).$$

We claim that $\mathscr{H}^{-1}(s)$ is an open of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$. By Proposition 2.4, $\mathscr{H}^{-1}(s)$ is in bijection with an open set of isomorphism classes of rank one torsion free $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_s}-$modules. Given such torsion free $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{X}_s}-$module $\mathscr{F}$, we have $\tilde{\sigma}^*\mathscr{F} \cong \mathscr{F}^*(\tilde{S})$. It follows that the line bundle $L = \mathfrak{q}^*(\mathscr{F}(-\tilde{R}))$ on $\hat{X}_s$ verifies

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\sigma}^*L &\cong \mathfrak{q}^*(\tilde{\sigma}^*\mathscr{F}(-\tilde{R})) \\ &\cong \mathfrak{q}^*(\mathscr{F}^*(-\tilde{R} + \tilde{S}) \\ &\cong (\mathfrak{q}^*\mathscr{F})^{-1}(\hat{S}) \\ &\cong L^{-1}(\hat{S})\end{aligned}$$

In fact the isomorphism $\hat{\sigma}^*L \cong L^{-1}(\hat{S})$ is induced by ψ, hence it is $\hat{\sigma}-$alternating, thus $L \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}$.
Conversely, given $L \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}$ such that $\hat{q}_*L$ is stable, then by duality of finite flat morphisms we deduce that $\hat{q}_*L$ is $\sigma-$alternating anti-invariant vector bundle.

We have seen that the involution $\hat{\sigma}$ has no fixed point, hence $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ has two connected components distinguished by the parity of

$$h^0(L \otimes \hat{q}^*\kappa) = h^0(\hat{q}_*L \otimes \kappa),$$

where κ is a theta characteristic over X. It follows that the image of the two connected components of $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ can't intersect. Moreover, for some $\sigma-$invariant square root η of $\mathcal{O}(R)$, we have $\kappa = \eta \otimes \pi^*\kappa'$, where κ' is a theta characteristic over Y. As the $\sigma-$bilinear form $\tilde{\psi} : E \otimes \sigma^*E \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$ is $\sigma-$alternating, that's to say

$$\tilde{\psi}(s \otimes \sigma^*t) = -\nu(\sigma^*(\tilde{\psi}(t \otimes \sigma^*s))),$$

where $\nu : \sigma^*\mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{O}_X$ is the positive linearisation. Tensorizing with η we get a bilinear form

$$(E \otimes \eta) \otimes \sigma^*(E \otimes \eta) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(R),$$

which induces a symmetric non degenerate bilinear form

$$\pi_*(E\otimes\eta)\otimes\pi_*(E\otimes\eta)\longrightarrow\mathcal{O}_Y,$$

hence, using the result of Mumford [Mum71], the map $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)\to\mathbb{Z}/2$ given by

$$E\longrightarrow h^0(\pi_*E\otimes\kappa')\mod 2$$

is constant under deformation of E. This implies that $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$ has two connected components. □

4.2.2. *The étale case.* Assume now that $\pi: X\to Y$ is étale.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. It is clear that $W^{\sigma,-}=W^{\sigma,+}$, and for general $s\in W^{\sigma,-}$, the associated spectral curve $\tilde{X}_s$ is smooth and the attached involution $\tilde{\sigma}$ has no fixed points. Define

$$\mathcal{P}^-=\widetilde{\mathrm{Nm}}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}(S)\otimes\tilde{\Delta})\subset\mathrm{Pic}^m(\tilde{X}_s).$$

It follows by Lemma 3.9, that the isomorphism $\tilde{\sigma}^*L\xrightarrow{\sim}L^{-1}(\tilde{S})$ is $\tilde{\sigma}-$alternating. Moreover, let ξ be a line bundle over X of norm Δ, and $E\in\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)$. As $\sigma^*\xi\to\xi^{-1}$ is $\sigma-$alternating, then $\sigma^*(E\otimes\xi)\xrightarrow{\sim}(E\otimes\xi)^*$ is $\sigma-$alternating too. As $q^*\Delta=\tilde{\Delta}$, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Nm}}(q^*\xi)=q^*\mathrm{Nm}(\xi)=\tilde{\Delta},$$

it follows that $q^*\xi$ induce by translation an isomorphism $\mathcal{P}^+\cong\mathcal{P}^-$. This, with Theorem 4.12, ends the proof of Theorem 1.2. □

Remark 4.22. In this case the determinant induces a morphism $\det:\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)\to P=\mathrm{Nm}^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_Y)$ if r is even, and $\det:\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)\to P':=\mathrm{Nm}^{-1}(\Delta)$ if r is odd.

5. The Hitchin system for invariant vector bundles

We have seen that the $\sigma-$invariant vector bundles of fixed type τ corresponds to parabolic vector bundles over Y with parabolic structures associated to τ at the ramification points. The Hitchin systems for parabolic vector bundles has been studied by Logares and Martens [LM]. In this special case we have an explicit description of the fibres of the Hitchin map, as well as a dominance result as in the case of anti-invariant vector bundles.

We use results and notations of the last section. We suppose always that the cover $X\to Y$ is ramified, the étale case is trivial. Fix the *negative* linearisation on K_X (so we have $\bar{\sigma}(x)=-x$, where $\bar{\sigma}$ is the involution on $\mathbb{S}=\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_X\oplus K_X^{-1})$ induced by the positive linearisations). Denote by

$$\rho:\sigma^*K_X\to K_X$$

this linearisation. Let $W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}=\bigoplus_{i=1}^r H^0(K_X^i)_+$ (The $\mathfrak{m}$ in the notation refers to *maximal* types).
For simplicity, we assume hereafter that the degree d of the $\sigma-$invariant vector bundles is 0.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $s\in W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}$, $\tilde{X}_s$ the associated spectral curve, then σ lifts to an involution $\tilde{\sigma}$ on $\tilde{X}_s$. Moreover, for general such s, we have*

- *If r is even, then this involution has no fixed point.*
- *If r is odd, this involution has just $2n$ fixed points.*

Proof. consider $s = (s_1, \cdots, s_r) \in W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}$, let $p \in X$, and $x_0 = [x_0 : 1] \in (\tilde{X}_s)_p$, then the involution $\bar{\sigma}$ on $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_X \oplus K_X^{-1})$ sends x_0 to $y_0 = -x_0$, but y_0 is a solution to

$$x^r + s_1(\sigma(p))x^{r-1} + \cdots + s_r(\sigma(p)) = 0.$$

Indeed

$$\begin{aligned} y_0^r + s_1(\sigma(p))y_0^{r-1} + \cdots + s_r(\sigma(p)) &= (-x_0)^r + (-s_1(p))(-x_0)^{r-1} + \cdots + (-1)^r s_r(p) \\ &= (-1)^r \left(x_0^r + s_1(p)x_0^{r-1} + \cdots + s_r(p)\right) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

hence $\bar{\sigma}(x_0)$ is in $(\tilde{X}_s)_{\sigma(p)}$, thus $\bar{\sigma}$ induces an involution on $\tilde{X}_s$ which we are looking for.
One remarks that for odd i, $s_i(p) = 0$, for any $p \in R$. Suppose that r is odd, this implies that 0 is always in $(\tilde{X}_s)_p$, and for general $s \in W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}$, it is a simple root of the equation above, hence there are just $2n$ fixed points in $\tilde{X}_s$. If r is even, we deduce that for general s, $\tilde{\sigma}$ has no fixed point. □

In particular, using Riemann-Roch formula, we get for general $s \in W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}$:

$$g_{\tilde{Y}_s} = \frac{1}{2} g_{\tilde{X}_s} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{k}{2},$$

where k is the half of the number of fixed points of $\tilde{\sigma}$. As $g_{\tilde{X}_s} = r^2(g_X - 1) + 1$ and $g_X - 1 = 2(g_Y - 1) + n$, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(\mathrm{Pic}^m(\tilde{X}_s)^{\tilde{\sigma}}) = g_{\tilde{Y}_s} &= \begin{cases} r^2(g_Y - 1) + n\frac{r^2}{2} + 1 & r \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ r^2(g_Y - 1) + n\frac{r^2-1}{2} + 1 & r \equiv 1 \mod 2 \end{cases} \\ &= \dim(\mathcal{U}_X^\sigma(r, 0)). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.2. For general $s \in W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}$, $\tilde{X}_s$ is smooth.

Let E be a stable $\sigma-$invariant vector bundle. By Lemma 4.3, Serre duality is equivariant, so

$$H^1(X, E \otimes E^*)_+^* \xrightarrow{\sim} H^0(X, E \otimes E^* \otimes K_X)_+.$$

In particular we have

Proposition 5.3. *The Hitchin morphism induces a map*

$$\mathscr{H}_E : H^0(X, E \otimes E^* \otimes K_X)_+ \longrightarrow W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} H^0(X, K_X^i)_+.$$

Moreover, we have an equality of dimensions

$$dim(\mathcal{U}_X^\sigma(r, 0)) = dim(W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}).$$

Proof. By the proof of Proposition 4.4, we deduce that

$$\mathscr{H}_i(f(\phi)) = \rho^{\otimes i}(\sigma^*(\mathscr{H}_i(\phi))).$$

(Here, one should make a similar explicit local description of $\mathscr{H}_i$), this implies the first part of the lemma.
As we use the negative linearisation on K_X, by Remark 3.5, it follows

$$\begin{cases} h^0(X, K_X^i)_+ = h^0(Y, K_Y^i \otimes \Delta^i) = (2i - 1)(g_Y - 1) + in & i \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ h^0(X, K_X^i)_+ = h^0(Y, K_Y^i \otimes \Delta^{i-1}) = (2i - 1)(g_Y - 1) + (i - 1)n & i \equiv 1 \mod 2,\ i \geqslant 3 \\ h^0(X, K_X)_+ = h^0(Y, K_Y) = g_Y \end{cases}$$

taking the sum, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} h^0(X, K_X^i)_+ = \begin{cases} r^2(g_Y-1) + n\frac{r^2}{2} + 1 & r \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ r^2(g_Y-1) + n\frac{r^2-1}{2} + 1 & r \equiv 1 \mod 2 \end{cases}.$$

□

5.1. **Smooth case.** Recall that we have defined a maximal type to be a type τ such that $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,0)$ has maximal dimension, and we have denoted the set of such types by $\mathfrak{MAX}$.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $s \in W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}$ such that $\tilde{X}_s$ is smooth. Then the direct image map induces a dominant map*

$$q_* : Pic^m(\tilde{X}_s)^{\tilde{\sigma}} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}(r,0),$$

where $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}(r,0)$ is the moduli space of $\sigma-$invariant vector bundles of type $\tau \in \mathfrak{MAX}$ (see Remark 3.7). Moreover, for each type $\tau \in \mathfrak{MAX}$, there exists a unique types $\tilde{\tau}$ of invariant line bundles in $Pic(\tilde{X}_s)$, such that we have a dominant map

$$q_* : Pic^m(\tilde{X}_s)^{\tilde{\sigma},\tilde{\tau}} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,0).$$

Proof. It is clear that L is $\tilde{\sigma}-$invariant if and only if q_*L is $\sigma-$invariant.
By the proof of Theorem 4.11, for general $\sigma-$invariant vector bundle E of type $\tau \in \mathfrak{MAX}$, the restriction of the Hitchin map

$$\mathscr{H}_E : H^0(X, E \otimes E^* \otimes K_X)_+ \to W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}$$

is dominant. This implies that the map

$$\Pi : T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}(r,0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}(r,0) \times W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}$$

is dominant too. Moreover, if we fix a type $\tau \in \mathfrak{MAX}$, then there exists a corresponding type $\tilde{\tau}$ of $\tilde{\sigma}-$invariant line bundles on $\tilde{X}_s$, such that

$$\mathrm{Pic}^m(\tilde{X}_s)^{\tilde{\sigma},\tilde{\tau}} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,0)$$

is dominant. The type $\tilde{\tau}$ is constructed as follows: remark first that $\tilde{\tau} \in \{+1,-1\}^{2n}/\pm$. Suppose that r is odd (the even case is trivial), if $p \in R$ is such that $k_p = (r+1)/2$, then over such p, take -1 in $\tilde{\tau}$, and $+1$ over the rest of points in R (note that, because $s \in W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}$ is general, over each $p \in R$ there is just one fixed point by $\tilde{\sigma}$, so we identify $\tilde{R}$ with R in this case).

□

We prove in the next section that the only types corresponding to smooth spectral covers of X are the maximal ones.

5.2. **General case.** Now let τ be any type, for simplicity of notations we suppose that we have just one point $p \in R$ such that $k_p < [\frac{r}{2}]$, where $[\,]$ stands for the floor function. In fact we can always suppose $k_p \leqslant [r/2]$ due to tensorizing by $\mathcal{O}_X(p)$. And for all other ramification point $a \neq p$, k_a is maximal (that's $k_a = r/2$ if r is even, and $k_a = (r \pm 1)/2$ if r is odd).
To get a vector bundle of such type as a direct image, we should have $r - 2k_p$ fixed

points by $\tilde{\sigma}$ above p. Indeed, as $\tilde{\sigma}$ interchanges the two fibres L_x and $L_{\tilde{\sigma}(x)}$, its matrix over this two points is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence, one should have $2k_p$ unfixed points to get the -1 eigenvalue with multiplicity k_p. This intuition is proven in the following theorem

Theorem 5.5. *Let τ be a type as above, and denote by*

$$W^{\sigma,\tau} = H^0(K_X)_+ \oplus \cdots \oplus H^0(K_X^{2k_p+2}(-p))_+ \oplus H^0(K_X^{2k_p+3}(-2p))_+ \oplus \cdots \oplus H^0(K_X^r(-(r-2k_p-1)p))_+.$$

Then, for any $\sigma-$invariant stable vector bundle E of type τ, the Hitchin map factorises through $W^{\sigma,\tau}$ giving a map

$$\mathscr{H}_E : H^0(E \otimes E^* \otimes K_X)_+ \longrightarrow W^{\sigma,\tau}.$$

Moreover,

$$dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,0)) = dim(W^{\sigma,\tau}).$$

Proof. First we verify the dimensions. By the first section, we have

$$\dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,0)) = r^2(g_Y-1) + 1 + (2n-1)\frac{r^2}{4} + k_p(r-k_p).$$

Recall that we have fixed the negative linearisation on K_X. By Lefschetz fixed point formula we deduce that

(10)

$$h^0(X, K_X^k(-ip))_+ = (2k-1)(g_Y-1) + \begin{cases} kn - \frac{i}{2} & k \equiv 0,\ i \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ kn - \frac{i+1}{2} & k \equiv 0,\ i \equiv 1 \mod 2 \\ (k-1)n - \frac{i}{2} & k \equiv 1,\ i \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ (k-1)n - \frac{i-1}{2} & k \equiv 1,\ i \equiv 1 \mod 2 \end{cases}.$$

So the dimension of the $W^{\sigma,\tau}$ is given by

$$\dim(W^{\sigma,\tau}) = \dim(W^{\sigma,\mathfrak{m}}) - \sum_{i=1}^{r-2k_p-1} d(i),$$

where

$$d(i) = \begin{cases} \frac{i}{2} & \text{if } i \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ \frac{i+1}{2} & \text{if } i \equiv 1 \mod 2 \end{cases}.$$

By a simple calculus, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r-2k_p-1} d(i) = \begin{cases} \frac{r^2}{4} - k_p(r-k_p) & \text{if } i \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ \frac{r^2-1}{4} - k_p(r-k_p) & \text{if } i \equiv 1 \mod 2 \end{cases}.$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(W^{\sigma,\tau}) &= \begin{cases} r^2(g_Y-1) + 1 + (2n-1)\frac{r^2}{4} + k_p(r-k_p) & \text{if } r \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ r^2(g_Y-1) + 1 + (2n-1)\frac{r^2-1}{4} + k_p(r-k_p) & \text{if } r \equiv 0 \mod 2 \end{cases} \\ &= \dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r,0)). \end{aligned}$$

Now take $\phi \in H^0(X, E \otimes E^* \otimes K_X)_+$, let $\varphi : \sigma^* E \cong E$, then the following diagram commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \phi : & E & \longrightarrow E \otimes K_X \\ & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \varphi} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle {}^t\varphi \otimes \sigma^* \rho} \\ \sigma^*\phi : & \sigma^* E & \longrightarrow \sigma^* E \otimes \sigma^* K_X, \end{array}$$

that's

$$\sigma^* \phi = ({}^t\varphi \otimes \sigma^* \rho) \circ \phi \circ \varphi.$$

In particular over p, one has

$$\phi_p = -A_p \phi_p A_p,$$

where $A_p = \mathrm{diag}(\underbrace{-1, \cdots, -1}_{k_p}, 1, \cdots, 1)$ is $r \times r$ diagonal matrix.

This implies that the matrix ϕ_p is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & M \\ N & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where M and N are two matrices of type $k_p \times (r - k_p)$ and $(r - k_p) \times k_p$.
Now let t be a local parameter on the neighbourhood of p, and denote $\phi(t) = \phi_p + t\phi'$ the restriction of ϕ to this neighbourhood. Then we get

$$s_r(t) = \det(\phi(t)) = \det(\phi_p + t\phi').$$

But

$$\phi_p + t\phi' = \begin{pmatrix} t \times * & M' \\ N' & t \times * \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

where M' and N' are two matrices of type $k_p \times (r - k_p)$ and $(r - k_p) \times k_p$ respectively, which are not necessarily divisible by t. Thus $\det(\phi(t))$ is divisible by t^{r-2k_p}, hence

$$\det(\phi(t)) \in H^0(X, K_X^r(-(r - 2k_p)p))_+ = H^0(X, K_X^r(-(r - 2k_p - 1)p))_+.$$

The general case is treated similarly. Consider $\phi(t)$ as an element of $\mathcal{M}at_r(\mathbb{C}[[t]])$, and denote it by $\phi(t) = (a_{i,j}(t))_{i,j}$. As $\mathscr{H}_i(\phi)$ is by definition $(-1)^i \mathrm{Tr}(\Lambda^i \phi(t))$. We just need to calculate the diagonal elements of the matrix $\Lambda^i \phi(t)$. Assume that

$$\Lambda^i \phi(t) = (\alpha_{\underline{k},\underline{l}}(t)),$$

where $\underline{k}$ and $\underline{l}$ are i-tuples of strictly increasing integer in $\{1, \cdots, r\}$. Then if $\underline{k} = (k_1 < \cdots < k_i)$ we have

$$\alpha_{\underline{k},\underline{k}}(t) = \det(a_{k_l, k_{l'}}(t))_{1 \leqslant l, l' \leqslant i}.$$

Hence, from the form of $\phi(t)$ given in (11), we deduce that $\mathscr{H}_i(\phi(t))$ is divisible by t^{i-2k_p}, hence

$$\mathscr{H}_i(\phi) \in H^0(X, K_X^i(-(i - 2k_p)p))_+ = H^0(X, K_X^i(-(i - 2k_p - 1)p))_+.$$

Thus

$$\mathscr{H}_E(\phi) \in W^{\sigma,\tau}.$$

□

Unfortunately, most of the types corresponds to singular spectral curve $\tilde{X}_s \to X$. But for general $s \in W^{\sigma,\tau}$ where τ is as above, the corresponding $\tilde{X}_s$ has just the point 0 over p which is singular with multiplicity equals $r - 2k_p$. Moreover, this singularity is ordinary. Hence the geometric genus of the normalisation $\hat{X}_s$ of $\tilde{X}_s$ is equals to

$$g_{\hat{X}_s} = r^2(g_X - 1) + 1 - \frac{(r - 2k_p)(r - 2k_p - 1)}{2}.$$

Moreover, the involution $\tilde{\sigma}$ lifts to an involution $\hat{\sigma}$ on $\hat{X}_s$ with $r - 2k_p$ fixed points (Recall that we assume for simplicity that we have just one point $p \in R$ with $k_p < [r/2] - 1$). Indeed, if t is a local parameter in a local neighbourhood of p and x is a local parameter near the ramification point $0 \in \tilde{R}$ over p, then by definition, $\tilde{\sigma}$ send $t \to -t$ and $x \to -x$, thus it does not interchange the two branches near λ



It follows that the genus $g_{\hat{Y}_s}$ of $\hat{Y}_s = \hat{X}_s/\hat{\sigma}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\hat{Y}_s} &= \frac{1}{2}\left(g_{\hat{X}_s} + 1 - \frac{r - 2k_p}{2}\right) \\ &= \frac{r^2}{2}(g_X - 1) + 1 - \frac{(r - 2k_p)^2}{4} \\ &= r^2(g_Y - 1) + 1 + n\frac{r^2}{2} - \frac{(r - 2k_p)^2}{4} \\ &= r^2(g_Y - 1) + 1 + (2n - 1)\frac{r^2}{4} + k_p(r - k_p). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\dim(\mathrm{Pic}^m(\hat{X}_s)^{\hat{\sigma}}) = \dim(\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r, 0)).$$

So the generic fibre of the Hitchin morphism

$$\mathscr{H} : T^*\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r, 0) \longrightarrow W^{\sigma,\tau}$$

is of maximal dimension. So we get again the complete integrability of the Hitchin system in this case too.

Moreover, with the same method used so far in the proof of the dominance, we deduce

Theorem 5.6. *For each type τ, the pushforward map*

$$Pic^m(\hat{X}_s)^{\hat{\sigma},\hat{\tau}} \dashrightarrow \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,\tau}(r, 0)$$

is dominant, for some type $\hat{\tau}$ of $\hat{\sigma}-$invariant line bundles over $\hat{X}_s$.

6. Appendices

6.1. **Appendix A.** In this appendix, we construct stable anti-invariant vector bundles. Let $\beta \in J_X[r]$ an $r-$torsion point of the Jacobian, and denote by $q : X_\beta \longrightarrow X$ the associated cyclic étale cover of X of degree r, and by ι a generator of the Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(X_\beta/X)$.

Lemma 6.1. *The involution $\sigma : X \to X$ lifts to an involution $\tilde{\sigma} : X_\beta \to X_\beta$. Moreover, if r is even, there is two such lifting of σ such that one of them has no fixed points, we denote it by $\tilde{\sigma}_-$.*

Proof. The curve X_β is a spectral curve given by equation $x^r - 1 = 0$ in the ruled surface $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{O}_X \oplus \beta^{-1})$. As in the proof of Proposition 4.1, the positive linearisation on β gives an involution $\tilde{\sigma}$ on X_β that lifts σ. If r is even, then the negative linearisation gives also a lifting of σ. One remarks that $q(\mathrm{Fix}(\tilde{\sigma})) \subset \mathrm{Fix}(\sigma)$, hence if $\pi : X \to Y$ is étale, then so is $X_\beta \to X_\beta/\tilde{\sigma}$. However, if r is even, the negative linearisation has no fixed point because 0 is not a root of $x^r - 1 = 0$. □

Proposition 6.2. *The line bundles of degree 0 on X_β such that q_*L is not stable are those with a non trivial stabiliser subgroup of $\langle\iota\rangle$.*

Proof. This is true for any Galois cover, it is proved in the (unpublished) paper of Beauville "On the stability of the direct image of a generic vector bundle".
Let $L \in \mathrm{Pic}^0(X_\beta)$ such that q_*L is not stable. Let $F \hookrightarrow q_*L$ be a stable subbundle of degree 0, it follows

$$q^*F \hookrightarrow q^*q_*L = L \oplus \iota^*L \oplus \cdots \oplus (\iota^{r-1})^*L,$$

hence q^*F is of the form $\bigoplus_{j\in J}(\iota^j)^*L$ for some $J \subsetneq \{0, \cdots, r-1\}$. In particular both F and q_*L are semistable. In the other hand, The adjunction formula gives a non vanishing map $q^*F \to (\iota^k)^*L$ for any k, as q^*F is semistable of degree 0, this map is surjective. Hence $\bigoplus_{j\in J}(\iota^j)^*L \to (\iota^k)^*L$ is surjective for any k, it follows that there exists $k \in \{1, \cdots, r-1\}$ such that $(\iota^k)^*L \cong L$. So ι^k is in the stabiliser of L.
Conversely, let L such that $(\iota^k)^*L \cong L$ for some $0 < k < r$, it follows that $L \oplus \cdots \oplus (\iota^k)^*L$ is $\iota-$invariant, so it descends to a vector bundle, say F, on X, as $\deg(F) = 0$, by adjunction, we deduce that $F \hookrightarrow q_*L$, hence q_*L is not stable. □

Now we can construct some stable anti-invariant vector bundles.

Proposition 6.3. *(1) There exist stable $\sigma-$symmetric and $\sigma-$alternating anti-invariant vector bundles.*
(2) The determinant maps

$$det : \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(r) \to P^+ = Nm^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_Y),$$
$$det : \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(r) \to P^- = \begin{cases} Nm^{-1}(\mathcal{O}_Y) & r \equiv 0 \mod 2 \\ Nm^{-1}(\Delta) & r \equiv 1 \mod 2 \text{ and } \pi \text{ étale} \end{cases},$$

are surjective.

Proof. We denote $Y_\beta = X_\beta/\tilde{\sigma}$ and $Z_\beta = X_\beta/\tilde{\sigma}_-$ if r is even. By Proposition 6.2 we deduce that a general element in $\mathrm{Nm}^{-1}_{X_\beta/Y_\beta}(\mathcal{O}_{Y_\beta})$ has a stable direct image which is $\sigma-$symmetric, a general element in $\mathrm{Nm}^{-1}_{X_\beta/Z_\beta}(\Delta_\beta)$ has a stable direct image which is $\sigma-$alternating, and if r is odd, a general element in $\mathrm{Nm}^{-1}_{X_\beta/Y_\beta}(\Delta_\beta)$ has a stable

direct image which is also $\sigma-$alternating.
If π is ramified, or π is étale and r is odd, then the second point is clear due to taking the tensor product of a fixed anti-invariant vector bundle by elements of $P^{\pm}$. Assume that π is étale and r is even, tensorizing by elements of $P^{\pm}$ does not make the determinant surjective, so we need to prove the existence of stable vector bundles whose determinants are in both connected components of $P^{\pm}$. But one remarks that $\mathrm{Nm}_{X_\beta/X} : \mathcal{P}^{\pm} \to P^{\pm}$ is surjective, where $\mathcal{P}^{+} = \mathrm{Nm}^{-1}_{X_\beta/Y_\beta}(\mathcal{O}_{Y_\beta})$ and $\mathcal{P}^{-} = \mathrm{Nm}^{-1}_{X_\beta/Y_\beta}(\Delta_\beta)$, as we have $\det(q_*L) = \mathrm{Nm}_{X_\beta/X}(L) \otimes \beta^{r(r-1)/2}$, this ends the proof. □

6.2. **Appendix B.** In this appendix, we treat the rank 2 case. Assume that $\pi : X \to Y$ is ramified. In this case every vector bundle E over X with trivial determinant is a Sp_2-bundle, that's $E \cong E^*$ with a symplectic quadratic form, and it admits a symmetric one if and only if it is polystable.
We see in this particular case that $\sigma-$invariant bundles are the same as $\sigma-$anti-invariant bundles, so let (E, ϕ) be a stable $\sigma-$invariant bundle with trivial determinant, recall that its type must be of the form

$$\tau = (\mathbf{0}, \cdots, \mathbf{0}),$$

$$\text{or } \tau = (A_1, \cdots, A_{2n}), \text{with } A_i \in \{+\mathbf{1}, -\mathbf{1}\},$$

where $\mathbf{0} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\pm\mathbf{1} = \begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \pm 1 \end{pmatrix}$.
We have

$$\sigma^* E \xrightarrow{\phi} E \xrightarrow{q} E^*,$$

where q is a symplectic quadratic form, let $\psi = q \circ \phi$. It is not difficult to see that if E has a type $(\mathbf{0}, \cdots, \mathbf{0})$, then ψ is $\sigma-$symmetric, and it is $\sigma-$alternating otherwise. In particular, one deduces that $\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(2)$ is connected, and $\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,-}(2)$ has 2^{2n-1} connected components. Moreover, we have surjective maps

$$\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(2) \times P \to \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(2),$$

$$\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,-}(2) \times P \to \mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(2).$$

In particular this gives another proof of the irreducibility of $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,+}(2)$.
The group $P[2]$ acts on the connected components of $\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,-}(r)$, and modulo element of $\pi^* J_Y[2]$, this action is free, as $\mathrm{card}(P[2]/\pi^* J_Y[2]) = 2^{2n-2}$, we deduce that this action has two orbits. It follows in particular that $\mathcal{U}_X^{\sigma,-}(2)$ has two connected components.

6.3. **Appendix C.** Here, we prove that the locus of stable and non very stable $\sigma-$symmetric anti-invariant vector bundle of rank 2 is at least 1.

Let E be such vector bundle, denote by $\psi : \sigma^* E \cong E^*$, and let

$$\phi \in H^0(X, E \otimes \sigma^* E \otimes K_X)_+$$

be nilpotent Higgs field. In particular $\phi \in H^0(X, \mathrm{End}_0(E) \otimes K_X)_+$. So we can suppose that $\det(E) \cong \mathcal{O}_X$. Then let L^{-1} be the kernel of $\phi : E \to E \otimes K_X$, which

is a line bundle of degree $-d < 0$. We have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & L^{-1} & \longrightarrow & E & \xrightarrow{p} & L & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle 0} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi} & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & L^{-1}\otimes K_X & \xrightarrow{i} & E\otimes K_X & \longrightarrow & L\otimes K_X & \longrightarrow & 0, \end{array}$$

This implies that ϕ factorises through L, that's to say, there exists $\phi' : L \to E\otimes K_X$ such that $\phi = \phi' \circ p$. Moreover, as $(\phi \otimes 1_{K_X}) \circ \phi = 0$, this implies that

$$(\phi \otimes 1_{K_X}) \circ \phi' = 0,$$

hence ϕ' factorises through $\mathrm{Ker}(\phi \otimes 1_{K_X}) = L^{-1} \otimes K_X$. Hence there exists $s \in H^0(X, L^{-2} \otimes K_X)$ such that

$$\phi = i \circ s \circ p.$$

In particular $d \leqslant g_X - 1$.

But, as ϕ is invariant, the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma^*\phi & : \sigma^*E \longrightarrow & \sigma^*E \otimes \sigma^*K_X \\ & {\scriptstyle \psi^{-1}}\uparrow & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi\otimes\eta} \\ {}^t\phi \otimes 1_{K_X} & : E^* \longrightarrow & E^* \otimes K_X, \end{array}$$

commutes. It follows that L^{-1} is ψ isotropic. Furthermore, we have the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \sigma^*L^{-1} & \longrightarrow & \sigma^*E & \xrightarrow{p} & \sigma^*L & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi} & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & L^{-1} & \longrightarrow & E^* & \xrightarrow{i^*} & L & \longrightarrow & 0, \end{array}$$

which implies that ψ induces a non vanishing map $\sigma^*L^{-1} \to L^{-1}$, hence it is an isomorphism. Thus L^{-1} (and so L) is $\sigma-$invariant line bundle.

Finally, given a stable and non very stable vector bundle E of rank 2 with a non zero nilpotent Higgs field ϕ, is the same as given a $\sigma-$invariant line bundle L and an anti-invariant extension $\xi \in \mathrm{Ext}^1(L, L^{-1})_-/\mathbb{C}^*$ (modulo a scalar) such that $\deg(L) = d \in \{1, \cdots, g_X - 1\}$, with a non zero section

$$s \in H^0(X, L^{-2} \otimes K_X)_+.$$

Fix the degree d. And for simplicity, we suppose that L descends to $M \in \mathrm{Pic}^{d/2}(Y)$. Define

$$\Theta_d = \{[M] \in \mathrm{Pic}^{d/2}(Y) \mid h^0(M^{-2}K_Y\Delta) > 0\}.$$

The dimension of Θ_d is given by

$$\min\{g_Y, -d + 2(g_Y - 1) + n\} =: \theta(d),$$

and the dimension of $\mathrm{Ext}^1(L, L^{-1})_- \cong H^1(X, L^{-2})_-$ can be calculated easily using the fact that the fixed linearisation on K_X is the positive. We obtain

$$\dim(\mathrm{Ext}^1(L, L^{-1})_-/\mathbb{C}^*) = h^1(Y, M^{-2}) - 1 = d + g_Y - 2.$$

Thus, the locus of such bundles has a dimension

$$\theta(d) + d + g_Y - 2 + h^0(Y, M^{-2} \otimes K_Y \otimes \Delta),$$

but for general $M \in \Theta_d$, $h^0(M^{-2} \otimes K_Y \otimes \Delta) = \min\{1, d-(g_Y-2)-n\}$. So it follows easily that the dimension that we look for is

$$\theta(d) + d + g_Y - 2 + \min\{1, d-(g_Y-2)-n\} = 3(g_Y-1)+n$$
$$= \dim(\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(r)).$$

But this locus inside $T^*\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(2)$ is conic, that's to say stable by the canonical action of $\mathbb{C}^*$, hence over each point of $\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(2)$ the fibre of this locus has dimension at least 1. This implies that its image in $\mathcal{SU}_X^{\sigma,+}(2)$ has codimension at least 1.

References

[AB68] M. F. Atiyah and R. Bott. A Lefschetz fixed point formula for elliptic complexes: II. applications. *Annals of Mathematics, Second Series, Vol. 88*, pages 451–491, Nov. 1968.

[Bea06] Arnaud Beauville. Orthogonal bundles on curves and theta functions. *Annales de linstitut Fourier*, 56(5):1405–1418, 2006.

[BL04] Christina Birkenhake and Herbert Lange. *Complex Abelian Varieties*. Springer, 2004.

[BNR89] A. Beauville, M.S. Narasimhan, and S. Ramanan. Spectral curves and the generalised theta divisor. *Journal fur die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, volume 398:169–179, 1989.

[BS14] V. Balaji and C. S. Seshadri. Moduli of parahoric G-torsors on a compact riemann surface. *J. Algebraic Geom. 24 (2015)*, pages 1–49, 2014.

[Edi92] Bas Edixhoven. Néron models and tame ramification. *Compositio Mathematica*, 81(3):291–306, 1992.

[Har77] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic Geometry*. Springer, 1977.

[Hit87] Nigel Hitchin. Stable bundles and integrable systems. *Duke Math. J.*, 54(1):91–114, 1987.

[Lau88] Gérard Laumon. Un analogue global du cône nilpotent. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 57(2):647–671, 1988.

[LM] M. Logares and J. Martens. Moduli of parabolic Higgs bundles and Atiyah algebroids. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)*, 2010:89116.

[Mum71] David Mumford. Tetha characteristics of an algebraic curve. *Ann. scient. Ec. Norm. Sup. 4e serie*, pages 181–192, 1971.

[ND89] M.S. Narasimhan and J.-M. Drezet. Groupe de picard des variétés de modules de fibrés semi-stables sur les courbes algébriques. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 97(1):53–94, 1989.

[PH09] Christian Pauly and Lange Herbert. Polarizations of Prym varieties for Weyl groups via abelianization. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 11:315–349, 2009.

Laboratoire de Mathématiques J.A. Dieudonné.
E-mail address: z.hacen@gmail.com